

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 30, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As we approach the celebration of the birth of our country, we are conscious, O God, of all the blessings that we have received. We are grateful for the resources of people and material gifts of spiritual values, and the contributions of so many traditions that have been woven into the fabric of our society. As we pray that we will be the people You would have us be, so may we, with integrity and honesty, look at our communities and do what we can to right the wrongs, to heal the divisions, to catch the vision of a united people, one in purpose and one in design, promoting justice, and mercy for every person. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DREIER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2155. An Act to authorize the appropriation of funds for the Federal share of the cost of the construction of a Forest Ecosystem Research Laboratory at Oregon State University in Corvallis, Oregon, and for other purposes.

## DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 1994

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, July 13, 1994.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

## AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, July 12, 1994, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

## UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE FOR WORKING AMERICA

(Mr. FILNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of health care reform.

As a member of the freshman class, I was sent to Congress by the residents of California's 50th Congressional District to make significant changes in the way this country is run.

One of my highest priorities is to deliver the changes that they want in the way health care is provided—or in many cases, not provided.

I represent what is sometimes called a working class district. As we all know, the burden of our current health care system is heaviest on working Americans. Eighty percent of those who currently have no health insurance are working Americans—citizens who get up each day and put in an honest day's work, but do not make enough to afford expensive health insurance and whose employers do not provide it.

This is no way to treat working Americans. Universal health care coverage must be the immediate goal. We must fight the special interests so that we can make the changes and accomplish the job we were sent here to do.

## PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO HAVE UNTIL 5 P.M., JULY 8, 1994, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 4008, THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1994

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until 5 p.m. on July 8, 1994, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 4008, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1994, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S ATTITUDE TOWARD MILITARY

(Mr. BURTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have been appalled at the Clinton administration's attitude toward the military. In recent weeks, they have seen a U.S. helicopter, a Marine helicopter, used to take White House staff at a cost of \$14,000 to the taxpayers to go play golf.

The other night at the White House they had four officers that they made serve as waiters at a Democrat fundraiser at the White House. A two-star general at the White House was told by a top White House staffer that she did not talk to people in uniform.

Then during the Normandy trip, the White House staff stole 60 of these towels and about 30 of these robes away from the U.S.S. *George Washington*.

Mr. Speaker, a message needs to be sent to the White House, the President, his staff. There needs to be respect for the property of the taxpayers of this country and to the military. These people serve and defend us in time of war, and they need our utmost respect, not the contempt shown by the Clinton administration.

## UNIVERSAL COVERAGE FUNDAMENTAL TO HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to my colleagues about

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the importance of insuring that universal coverage is the main tenet of whatever health care legislation is passed.

If we were to pass health care legislation without providing coverage to all Americans, we would be performing a great disservice to those currently uninsured, and insured, as well as to our country at large.

As long as some Americans remain uninsured, the entire country is at risk. Not insuring everyone passes on economic burdens to businesses and individuals who are insured. I believe it is in everyone's best interest that all people receive proper health care. We will have a healthier society, a healthier work force, and better communities.

In North Carolina alone, without universal coverage, 578,217 people will be denied health care and businesses that currently offer insurance will pay an estimated \$387 million more in premium costs.

Providing universal coverage in any health care reform legislation is fundamental. Without universal coverage, any proposal bearing the name of health care reform is a sham.

#### DESIGNATION OF HON. STENY H. HOYER TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH JULY 12, 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 30, 1994.

I hereby designate the Honorable STENY H. HOYER to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through July 12, 1994.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to. There was no objection.

#### LEVEL OF ITS INCOMPETENCE

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the Peter Principle states: "In a hierarchy, every employee tends to rise to his level of incompetence."

A congressional corollary would be: "In a democracy, after 40 years of one-party control, the legislative branch tends to rise to the level of its incompetence." We saw that level of incompetence earlier this week, when the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee gave up trying to find a commonsense, bipartisan resolution to health care reform.

Mr. DINGELL blamed Republicans for "actively opposing efforts to craft a bi-

partisan bill," despite the fact that Republicans have actively worked in a bipartisan fashion to get a bill together. The Rowland-Bilirakis bill is the only bipartisan solution out there, and it is supported by the Republican leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrat leadership has become so partisan, after 40 years of one-party rule, it will not even recognize a bipartisan effort when it sees one. The Democrat leadership has finally reached its level of incompetence, and the health care debate is just one indication of that fact.

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE MUST NOT STAY BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

(Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate two women in my home city of Milwaukee who died at the hands of the person whom they should have been able to trust the most—their husbands.

First let me tell you about a young woman named Hoa, who escaped Cambodia and came to the United States in search of a better life. After years of abuse, Hoa sought protection at a shelter. She was working with the counselors to find safe, permanent housing when her husband found her, accused her of leaving their home to have an affair, and stabbed her to death.

Next, there is Denise, who was 21 when she obtained a restraining order against her husband; it did not work. Her husband broke into her home, shot and killed her. When the police found her body, she was clutching the restraining order in her hands.

These are only two of the many women who die at the hands of people they love or once loved. We must not forget that behind every statistic there is a human name and voice. They are our sisters, daughters, and mothers. We cannot shirk our responsibility as legislators. We must let the world know that we cannot and will not allow domestic violence to stay behind closed doors.

□ 1010

#### A CRISIS OF ITS OWN MAKING

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the administration is now in crisis mode to cope with the explosion of refugees from Haiti. It is hard to fathom that the people responsible for leading the free world might be so naive, but amazingly, administration officials are scratching their heads, or at least pretending to, about why their misery-producing embargo is causing more

Haitians to leave Haiti. This result was totally predictable and was predicted by those who know Haiti. Haitians are suffering and dying and the only hope they see is to head for a better life in the United States, an option, incidentally, that is looking more and more possible now under the new Clinton policy of winking at the rules for political asylum. Now the administration scrambles to develop contingency plans for the refugees: Jamaica, Turks and Caicos, Guantanamo Bay. What is next? What then? All signs point toward military intervention and more violence and misery. The current problems are a crisis of this administration's own making. Those innocent Haitians who do not starve or die of disease from the embargo, we are now going to put them in a war zone?

Mr. Speaker, why am I hearing only silence from those liberals who call themselves human rights activists who support this Clinton fiasco?

#### INCONSISTENCY IN VOTING

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, the work of any legislative body always involves compromise, and so absolutes like consistency, for instance, are always in short supply. Those backing the A to Z proposal have seemed especially resolute, however, in claiming the high ground on fiscal discipline, so Members can imagine the surprise and confusion late Tuesday night when 191 of our colleagues who had previously signed the discharge petition on A to Z then voted for the Baker amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriation bill.

That amendment added \$1 million to appropriations for libraries, but made no offsetting cuts, even through this bill was already at the maximum allowed under the caps imposed on our subcommittee. Those voting for this cap-breaking amendment included even the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF], the authors of A to Z. I guess there is a subtlety to this that I am missing.

Anyway, I thought the RECORD ought to include a full accounting of Members who have signed the discharge petition and who backed Baker, to boot.

Mr. Speaker, I include a list of those Members for the RECORD at this point.

SIGNED A TO Z DISCHARGE, VOTED FOR BAKER AMENDMENT

Allard	Bilbray	Callahan
Andrews (NJ)	Bilirakis	Calvert
Archer	Bliley	Camp
Bachus (AL)	Blute	Canady
Baesler	Boehner	Cantwell
Baker (CA)	Bonilla	Castle
Baker (LA)	Browder	Clinger
Ballenger	Brown (OH)	Coble
Barrett	Bunning	Collins (GA)
Bartlett	Burton	Combest
Bereuter	Buyer	Condit



Cooper	Hunter	Petri
Coppersmith	Hutchinson	Porter
Cox	Hyde	Portman
Crane	Inglis	Poshard
Crapo	Inhofe	Pryce (OH)
Cunningham	Istook	Quillen
DeFazio	Jacobs	Quinn
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Ramstad
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (GA)	Ravenel
Dickey	Johnson, Sam	Roberts
Doolittle	Kasich	Roemer
Dornan	Kim	Rohrabacher
Dreier	King	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan	Kingston	Roth
Dunn	Klug	Roukema
Ehlers	Knollenberg	Royce
Emerson	Kolbe	Santorum
English	Kyl	Saxton
Everett	Lazio	Schaefer
Ewing	Leach	Schenk
Fawell	Levy	Schiff
Fingerhut	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Shaw
Franks (CT)	Lightfoot	Shays
Franks (NJ)	Linder	Shuster
Galleghy	Livingston	Smith (MI)
Gallo	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Gekas	Machtley	Smith (OR)
Geren	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Gilchrest	Margolies-	Solomon
Gillmor	Mezvinsky	Spence
Gingrich	McCandless	Stearns
Goodlatte	McCollum	Stenholm
Goodling	McCrery	Stump
Goss	McCurdy	Sundquist
Grams	McHale	Sweet
Grandy	McHugh	Talent
Greenwood	McInnis	Tauzin
Gunderson	McKeon	Taylor (NC)
Hall (TX)	McMillan	Thomas (CA)
Hancock	Meehan	Thomas (WY)
Hansen	Meyers	Thurman
Harman	Mica	Torkildsen
Hastert	Miller (FL)	Upton
Hayes	Minge	Vucanovich
Hefley	Molinar	Walker
Herger	Moorhead	Walsh
Hoekstra	Morella	Weldon
Hoke	Nussle	Wolf
Holden	Oxley	Young (AK)
Horn	Packard	Young (FL)
Houghton	Paxon	Zeliff
Huffington	Peterson (MN)	Zimmer

#### A SUCCESSFUL FIRST 6 MONTHS FOR THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, when we reconvene week after next, the debate will continue on about the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and most-favored-nation trading status for the People's Republic of China.

While I know many of our colleagues are at this moment charging off to their districts, I think it is very important to note that today, June 30, will complete the first 6 months of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. One thing is clear, the predictions of gloom and doom which we heard throughout that debate last year have in fact proved to be untrue.

As soon as we complete our 1-minutes and any other business that is proceeding here today, Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICK- EY], and others will be joining me in talking about the success of the first 6

months of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

#### URGING MEMBERS TO SUPPORT THE LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, last year alone the Congress of the United States put almost \$6 billion worth of pork barrel spending projects into its spending bills. We will never balance the Federal budget unless we get this rush to the Federal trough under control.

That is why we need to make a fundamental change in the way this House works and the way this Government works. That is why I have always supported the line-item veto.

With the stroke of a pen, the President could cut out each pork project that Congress puts into each bill. That is why I am joining my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], in introducing legislation to adopt the real line-item veto.

A vote on the Solomon proposal was supposed to take place today. Like many of my colleagues, I was very disappointed to hear that it would be delayed for 2 weeks, until the week of July 11.

I also view this as an opportunity to go back to our districts and to our States and listen to the people. I think we will find that the American people strongly support the real line-item veto, so we can get our Federal spending under control.

Mr. Speaker, this may be our best chance to adopt the line-item veto and to get our economic House in order. I urge my colleagues to support the line-item veto.

#### URGING MEMBERS TO SIGN THE DISCHARGE PETITION ON THE PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

(Mr. DICKEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, the private property owner's bill of rights has been presented to this body, and I want to stand firmly behind it.

For 203 years we have seen the rights of private property owners in America being eroded, taken away, restricted, and frustrated. We have now a movement afoot to make sure that when the Government comes and takes property, that it must pay for it or it should leave the private property owners alone.

We have a discharge petition in this body, and I urge the Members of this body to sign the discharge petition so we can get the private property owners' bill of rights on this floor and before this body and pass it, so we can protect the individual property rights of the people of the United States.

#### URGING CRIME BILL CONFEREES TO INCLUDE THE STRONGEST VERSION OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

(Mr. OLIVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, domestic violence is among the most insidious of crimes. It is committed in the privacy of one's own home, behind drawn curtains and closed doors. The victims do not suffer on our streets or in our public parks but in their kitchens, their living rooms, and bedrooms all across America.

These are private crimes, but violent crimes nonetheless. And victims of domestic violence cross all age and economic boundaries. Mr. Speaker, here are two cases from my own district.

On March 22, 1993, Tara, age 22, a senior at the University of Massachusetts, was stabbed repeatedly by her former boyfriend, who was the father of her 11-month-old daughter. He then set her house on fire, and Tara died of smoke inhalation.

On August 14, Kelly, age 27, of West Springfield, was murdered by her boyfriend. Kelly, who was pregnant, was shot in the head twice.

The crime bill now in conference includes a provision I added to create advocates within the judicial system for victims of domestic violence. These advocates will ensure that domestic violence victims receive the full range of needed protection and support they are entitled to under the law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the crime bill conferees to include the strongest form of the Violence Against Women Act in their report along with full and necessary funding. Then we can go home to our districts knowing we have taken an important step toward ending the epidemic of domestic violence sweeping our country.

#### TAXPAYERS' FRIENDS CONSISTENTLY VOTE TO CUT SPENDING

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, there is an organization called the National Taxpayers Union that rates the Congress as to whether or not they are taxpayers' friends or big spenders. They take a look at each Member's voting record and decide whether or not that Member has done what he could to try to save the taxpayer money.

I was reminded of that particular chart a few moments ago when the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] was talking to us about a vote that occurred on the floor the other evening, and I thought we ought to analyze the people who he talked about in terms of that record.

He mentioned the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF]. When I look at the National Taxpayers rating, Mr. ZELIFF gets an A from the National Taxpayers Union. He is a taxpayers' friend.

On the other hand, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], who accused some Members of hypocrisy in his remarks, I look at the record and I find that the record of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] with the National Taxpayers Union in the first session of this Congress was indeed, what, an F. He rates as a big spender.

It seems to me we ought to have some element of fairness when people come to the floor and suggest hypocrisy on the part of others. Hypocrisy starts not in one vote. Hypocrisy is a question of all of the votes we cast, and whether or not we add up to being a taxpayers' friend or a big spender.

#### URGING BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSAL COVERAGE IN HEALTH CARE

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot of talk now about could we please have a bipartisan health care bill. I really do think we need a bipartisan health care bill, but the No. 1 thing that seems to be holding us up is whether or not we have universal coverage. I must ask, why pass a health care bill if we do not have universal coverage?

We have all sorts of examples just in the last year of things showing that if we make it accessible to people, unfortunately, there are a lot of people who would rather go spend that monthly premium for something else, run the risk, and then if they get sick, they are in the emergency ward and all the rest of us pay the bill.

Mr. Speaker, what are those examples? Let us look at the people who did not have flood insurance who lived in a flood zone. They could buy flood insurance. They knew they were in a flood zone. They did not. They asked the taxpayer to bail them out.

□ 1020

Look at people who did not have earthquake insurance, even though that they were in an area that had earthquakes, but they figured that the Federal Government would come bail them out.

Mr. Speaker, I think unless we find a way to have everybody covered in the health care plan, unfortunately we will still find a lot of people who will not pay, but since no one knows if they are going to get sick or be injured or not, they will be in there and we will pay.

I think universality is very important and we can have bipartisanship if we can get over that hurdle.

#### ADMINISTRATION'S HAITIAN POLICY

(Mr. HUTCHINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the administration argued two preposterous propositions regarding the misguided and wrongheaded Haitian policy.

It insisted, No. 1, that the sanctions are not exacerbating the malnutrition and starvation of thousands of Haitian children and that the sanctions are only hurting the wealthy.

Second, they insisted that the recent wave of refugees are the result of political oppression, not economic and nutritional deprivation.

In fact, according to a Harvard University study issued prior to the recent round of even tougher sanctions, it said that 1,000 children a month are dying because of the sanctions. Last week the U.S. Agency for International Development issued a factsheet that said that the embargo has a direct impact on the social and economic conditions of vulnerable Haitians whose numbers are steadily increasing.

Mr. Gray was wrong. The administration is wrong. The sanctions should be lifted and a bipartisan panel should be appointed by the President to recommend a new Haitian policy.

#### TV NATION DAY

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution to designate July 1, 1994, as "TV Nation Day."

"TV Nation" is a positive, upbeat news magazine show that focuses on what is right with America. It is a civics lesson presented in an exciting style, a program that shows how our Government works. And although "TV Nation" has no sex or violence, and does not invade the personal privacy of people, it is still entertaining and informative.

But "TV Nation" is important for other reasons. As the first joint venture between American and European television, "TV Nation" is bringing foreign money into the United States to create jobs. This arrangement not only fosters good will among nations, it also helps our economy. Moreover, because "TV Nation" is produced in New York City, the show will help boost the city's economy, providing many new employment opportunities. Unfortunately, the film and television industry has been leaving New York in recent years. It is our hope that TV Nation's decision to stay in New York will help reverse this trend, and bring the entertainment industry back to New York where it began.

TV Nation Day is clearly something we should celebrate.

Mr. Speaker, we should be proud that at last someone is doing something positive that does not focus on the worst elements of society.

#### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic murder of Nicole Simpson has raised our consciousness about domestic violence. If a man beats a woman in the middle of the street, no one debates whether it is a crime. But when an assault is committed against a woman by her husband in her own home, behind closed doors, some view the facts differently. Even the victims in many cases—including Nicole Simpson—choose not to report acts of violence or not to press charges.

We must raise awareness that domestic violence is indeed a horrible crime; unreported domestic violence is a crime unpunished. And we must help the women who cry out for help.

In the last 2 weeks since the Simpson murder, calls to shelters in my district from battered women have increased dramatically. The day after the murder, Rainbow Services Ltd., a shelter for battered women in San Pedro, received over three times the normal number of requests from battered women for restraining orders against their husbands. The 1736 Family Crisis Center hotline in Redondo Beach has received 25 percent more calls. This month alone, they received around 350 calls from women needing immediate shelter—they have only 33 beds. For the last 3 weeks, the Los Angeles Commission on Assaults Against Women hotline has received three times its normal number of calls on domestic violence. Domestic violence calls to the Community Helpline of the South Bay have increased 30 percent in the last 2 weeks.

In the last 5 years, domestic violence calls in L.A. County have increased by 36.9 percent. In 1993 alone, 67 women were murdered by their spouse, live-in, ex-spouse, or boyfriend. Spurred to action by the Simpson murder, The city of Los Angeles is responding to the increasing number of domestic violence calls to police agencies and hotlines with the creation of the Domestic Violence Task Force and increased funding. The city council has just agreed to spend \$5 million a year to develop more shelters, and the county board of supervisors approved spending \$1.1 million on the 18 shelters that already exist. I applaud these efforts, but we must do even more.

I recently visited the Hexagon House and Madison Emergency Shelter in Washington, DC, with several other



Members and Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala. There we saw some happy outcomes: women and children who had sought refuge from violent partners or fathers, and who received shelter, counseling, and transition assistance. Many battered and abused women aren't so lucky.

The Congress has an important opportunity to help save the lives of women and children suffering from domestic violence, and to help support shelters that provide refuge and help for many battered women. As the crime bill conferees reconcile the House and Senate versions, I urge them to include the provisions of the Violence Against Women Act, and to provide the full \$1.8 billion funding. Inclusion of the Violence Against Women provisions in the crime bill will help women across the United States—women who cannot wait any longer.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### FAIRNESS FOR FILIPINO WORLD WAR II VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, today, Congressman LANE EVANS and I are introducing a bill to restore fairness to the Filipino War veterans who served in World War II.

Early this month, we commemorated the bravery of our fighting men in Europe on the 50th anniversary of the D-day invasion. At this juncture, it seems equally fitting to recall the contributions of the thousands of Filipino veterans who fought side-by-side with forces from the United States mainland against a common enemy.

It is hard to believe that soon after the war ended—the war in which Filipino soldiers served and died defending the American flag in the epic battles of Bataan and Corregidor and through 4 years of enemy occupation—the 79th Congress in 1946 voted in a way that can only be considered to be a blatant discrimination against the Filipino veterans.

In the words of the Washington Post of June 17, 1947:

While the Philippine Islands were still under United States sovereignty, the President issued an order making the Filipino Army a part of the American Army. This made the Filipino soldiers who constituted that army a part of our fighting forces as much as were soldiers drafted from the states, and they remained in this status

until the eve of the Philippine independence. Last year, however, Congress passed the First Rescission Act denying to Filipino Veterans most of the benefits that go automatically to other veterans who were exposed to similar risks and hardships. We cannot help thinking that if Congress reviews the situation, with full realization that these men were members of our own army and subject to its orders, it will see that a grave injustice has been done.

This review is long overdue.

My bill, the Filipino Veteran Equity Act of 1994, would credit service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

President Harry S. Truman, who signed the Rescission Act, criticized it in the following words:

The passage and approval of this legislation does not release the United States from its moral obligation to provide for the heroic Filipino Veterans who have sacrificed so much for the common cause during the war. The Philippine Army veterans \* \* \* fought under the American flag and under the direction of our military leaders. I consider it a moral obligation of the United States to look after the welfare of the Filipino Veterans.

In 15 years, none of these veterans will be left alive. Many, until their dying day, were kept wondering and asking, "Do we deserve the 1946 Rescission Act? Haven't we suffered the same suffering as the American soldier fighting the same war? Do bullets and mortar shells ask if their target is an American or Filipino soldier?"

I urge my colleagues to join with me in correcting this injustice. We must recognize the contribution of the World War II Filipino veterans.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FILNER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I really want to congratulate the gentleman from California for bringing this forward. It has always struck me that all of our veterans fought for the same flag and as a Nation who has stood for diversity and stood for inclusiveness and all of that, I have just been amazed and horrified that so many are forgotten.

□ 1030

And I really thank you for bringing that to all of our attention. We all wish you well and hope we can correct that injustice. And as we go into the Fourth of July break, it is a good thing to remind people of.

Mr. FILNER. I thank the gentleman. The gentlewoman helps fight injustice in all sectors of society, and I thank you for joining me in this.

#### GAFFNEY BEARING PLANT AWARDED SHINGO PRIZE FOR EXCELLENCE IN MANUFACTURING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the Shingo Prize for Excellence in Manufacturing was established in 1988 and named to honor Shigeo Shingo. Dr. Shingo distinguished himself in Japan and the world as cocreator of the Toyota production system and an expert on manufacturing processes. The Shingo Prize is awarded annually to a few select firms that have made truly outstanding achievements in manufacturing—in quality, in productivity, and in plain, old-fashioned customer satisfaction.

When this award was first established, I am sure its sponsors expected to bestow it upon high-technology firms in places like California's Silicon Valley and North Carolina's Research Triangle. Well, Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 27, I was in Gaffney, SC, in my district, to take part in a ceremony awarding the coveted Shingo Prize to the Gaffney Bearing Plant of the Timken Co. This plant was one of only seven nationwide to receive the Shingo Award this year.

I had visited this plant, where Timken's tapered roller bearings are made, as recently as last summer, and had seen the improvements made throughout the plant, literally on every production line. In each area of the plant a large chart was posted to show what had been changed and what had been achieved. The statistics over 3 years are striking. Gaffney Bearing Plant has achieved: 28 percent increase in labor productivity; 22 percent improvement in schedule accomplishment; 46 percent reduction in inventory days; 56 percent reduction in customer concerns; 24 percent reduction in the cost of nonconformance; 27 percent reduction in average setup time; 41 percent reduction in BTU's consumed per component; and 47 percent reduction in defects per million pieces.

When I left the Gaffney Bearing Plant last summer, I thought to myself, "If only plants like this could be cloned and held out to the rest of our economy." In a way, the Shingo Prize does that; it spotlights this outstanding plant as a model, a shining example of how excellence can be attained by focusing on core manufacturing processes, by removing waste and reducing defects, and by striving constantly for a better product at a lower cost.

In the late 1980's, as competition in bearings became more and more global and more intense, the Timken Co. initiated what it called the Vision 2000 program. The goal was nothing less than to become the best-performing

manufacturing company in the world. At the time, many may have considered that goal rhetorical, a bit ambitious, especially for a plant in Gaffney, SC. On Monday, the Gaffney Bearing Plant showed anyone who was skeptical just what American workers can do when they are encouraged and empowered. Timken has removed two layers of management, decentralized key functions, used coaching methods in supervision, and focused its associates' time for 3- to 5-day periods on improving specific processes. The results are impressive, and they are still being racked up. Even as the Shingo Prize was being presented, Gaffney Bearing Plant was moving ahead with the next phase, with its signals set on new quality and efficiency goals.

When I spoke to Timken workers at the ceremony on the plant floor, I noted that although our economy was strong, the dollar was still being pounded in world currency markets. Fundamentally, I said, the dollar is falling against the yen and the mark because for too many years, we have imported more than we have exported. There are short-term solutions to the trade deficit; but in long term, I said, the real solution lay in their hands.

What is heartening, and my reason for making this statement, is that companies like Timken are rising to the challenge; plants in places like Gaffney are pointing the way, proving to the world that in the United States, we can still manufacture goods of world-class quality and be efficient and competitive.

Gaffney Bearing Plant deserves the Shingo Prize, and the Shingo Prize Council should be commended for selecting it. The Gaffney Plant also deserves our admiration for showing that American manufacturers can still be among the best performing companies in the world.

#### THE TRADEGY IN HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, no one can ignore the front-page pictures, the photographs, in the Washington Post this morning. They are pictures here under the headline "Haiti's Tiny Victims."

It talks about youngsters, malnourished or starving, and dying in Haiti. This is one of those pictures you just cannot close your eyes and make it go away. The scene comes back, and actually the scene in reality down there from firsthand observers is even worse than these pictures depict.

I know that there is a Harvard report that came out a few months ago from the Harvard International School of Public Health noting that 1,000 Haitian children a month, 1,000 children a month are dying as a direct result of

the United States embargo on Haiti. How many do you suppose are dying today now that we have intensified this embargo and made it even more stringent?

We cannot disavow the responsibility for these innocent victims.

I heard Bill Gray, the President's special assistant on Haiti, last night on CNN after we got home saying, "We aren't really causing any harm. Haiti is a poor country. Gee, they are having trouble there. This isn't our fault." Well, baloney. That is not true. We are causing this, and we have got to recognize that fact and accept the responsibility.

The facts are the relief flights are not getting in. The administration is holding them back, and the reason they are is because the military is getting ahold of the materials that are coming in, the medicine and the food, and selling them on the black market, and profiting and making themselves even more comfortable. Those relief flights are not going. They are not getting through because of the embargo.

We were feeding a million people in Haiti, 1 million people were counting on us for food and medicine. Those flights are not going through.

What are those folks doing? I will tell you what they are doing, they are starving and dying from disease. We are causing an economic catastrophe that is literally driving people into the sea. I read from the Washington Post yesterday, "There is nothing for us in Haiti," say the Haitians. "The embargo is killing us one by one. So whatever it takes I am going, going into the sea."

Despite Mr. Gray saying, "No, no nothing we are doing here is causing a problem for these people," baloney, he is wrong, and it is painful and it is deadly. I am very deeply troubled. I am very deeply troubled, as you can tell, by the Clinton foreign policy. Driving innocent victims into the sea is not what America is about, and it is not what democracy is about.

This Congress is complicit. We cannot escape our own accountability here. We are allowing it to happen. We endorse, by a very thin majority, a policy that is driving people into the sea, and it is wrong, and we all know it.

The sanctions have destroyed a very weak economy that was there, and the military junta is still profiting. How long is this going to go on? How long are we going to cancel the relief flights? What are we doing, creating a pretext for invasion? Is that what this is about?

Well, we have got another problem here. It is called the credibility at the White House. Bill Gray lost it with me on C-SPAN last night when I heard him say we are not causing a problem there, but there is more.

Aristide calls Haiti a house afire. We, of course, have helped set the house afire by helping torch it with our eco-

nomie sanctions, but more than that, then we have gone ahead and we have said to the Haitians, "Look, come on out. There is a better life in America." We have created a magnet.

We have now got a scene where people are literally floating out of Haiti on just about anything that will float. Our helicopters from the Coast Guard cutters are spotting them, sending the cutters to rescue them, and we have a tremendous number of refugees, because we have created an incentive for them to leave and an incentive for them to come. This is unbelievable. We have created this scene.

Now, the problem is this, two out of three of those Haitians are going to be returned to Haiti. So they are not going to believe that we are real people, because we are telling them there is a better life, and we are sending them back to starvation.

The real problem is another part of the magnet we have caused is we have changed the standards, despite Bill Gray's personal assurances to me and other Members of Congress, that we would maintain the standards for political asylumship, we now have a situation where 30 percent of those applying for asylum are being given asylum, and under the rules, traditionally that has been a 5-percent approval rate.

□ 1040

So we have not only deceived the Haitians, we are now in a position where we deceived Members of Congress because the rules have been changed even though we received assurances that they would not be.

Who can you believe in the Clinton administration? They are now feigning surprise by all this number of refugees. Is it a wave or is it a surge? Well, it is neither. It is a costly mess, costly in terms of dollars for taxpayers and lives of Haitians.

I do not know whether we are doing this as a pretext for an invasion or not. I do not know whether we are doing it because the President needs votes for his domestic agenda. I have no idea why we are doing this stupidity. There is no threat to our national security to justify an invasion, and there are better solutions out there. The White House knows it, and I wish they would attend to those solutions and stop the starvation and killing that is going on in Haiti.

#### PERMISSION FOR MEMBERS TO SUBMIT MATERIAL FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS ON JUNE 30, 1994

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for today, Thursday, June 30, 1994, all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extension of Remarks."



The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### CALLING FOR EXPANDED CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there has been a tentative agreement forced upon the Republican Party in this Congress on the Whitewater investigations. What has happened is the Democrat majority has said the only way we are going to have hearings in either the House or the Senate is if it is very structured and very limited. They want to limit it to three things: The death of Vincent Foster; the removal by the White House personnel immediately after his death of files from his office; and White House attempts to influence the Resolution Trust Corporation investigation of Mr. and Mrs. Clinton's role in the Arkansas S&L.

But the investigation by the House and the Senate should be much, much broader. I want to tell my colleagues why.

First of all, there are questions about Mr. Fiske, the special prosecutor's objectivity. Mr. Fiske was a very close associate at various times when they were both in New York practicing law with Bernie Nussbaum, one of the chief advisers to President Clinton. As a matter of fact, Mr. Fiske, the special prosecutor, special investigator in this case, tried to get Mr. Nussbaum appointed assistant counsel during the Iran-Contra investigation. Mr. Fiske's law firm represented the International Paper Co., which got a \$10 million loan from the Arkansas Development Finance Authority in Arkansas. His firm also represented the International Paper Co. during the time when they sold hundreds of acres to the Whitewater Development Corp.

Mr. Fiske recommended Louis Freeh, now head of the FBI, to be the head of the FBI to Mr. Nussbaum at the White House. So there is some question about whether there will be complete thoroughness on the part of Mr. Fiske and his staff in investigating the White House allegations.

But beyond that there is a lot of other things that need to be investigated because more and more is coming out daily.

First of all, why did then-Governor Bill Clinton pardon a convicted cocaine dealer, Dan Lasater, in 1990? Dan Lasater pleaded guilty to Federal drug charges in December 1986. But he served only 6 months of a 2½-year sentence. While he was reportedly under investigation by the Arkansas State

Police for drug dealing, President Clinton and the Government of Arkansas gave him \$664 million in bonds to sell for the State, which garnered him \$1.6 million in commissions.

Why did then-Governor Bill Clinton pardon convicted cocaine dealer Dan Lasater in 1990? After all this involvement with him and they gave big contributions to Clinton's campaign, he is then pardoned for cocaine trafficking. Was it because Dan Lasater was a large contributor, was it because Dan Lasater had flown the Governor around Arkansas and the country in his private jet? Was it because Dan Lasater gave Roger Clinton, President Clinton's brother, a job at his Florida horse stables and loaned him \$8,000 to pay back a drug debt? Did Bill Clinton know about the Lasater investigation and Lasater's drug use at the time he gave him \$664 million in State bonds to sell?

According to published accounts and Mr. Dennis Patrick, between \$60 million and \$107 million was traded in an account in his name at Lasater & Co. without his knowledge. That may have involved laundering of drug money. One day \$23 million was traded in his account. Patsy Thomasson, the chief personnel officer at the White House, was running Lasater & Co. She was chief financial officer at the time. Now she is special assistant to the President of the United States. Where did this money come from? Where did it go? Did Ms. Thomasson know about these transactions? I do not know how she could not have.

There are, of course, other things that need to be explained.

In 1985 the Arkansas Development Finance Authority was created by Bill Clinton to provide economic development loans to small businesses in Arkansas. A number of serious questions have been raised about ADFA which need to be investigated.

Listen to this: On December 29, 1988, ADFA deposited \$50 million in a bank in the Cayman Islands. Why are you taking money out of the State of Arkansas and putting it in the Cayman Islands? This money was transferred through Simmons First National Bank of Pine Bluff, AR. Why did ADFA deposit \$50 million in an offshore bank instead of a bank in some other part of the country or in Arkansas? The interest rates were approximately the same.

The State Department's international narcotics control report described the Cayman Islands as a haven for the laundering of drug money. And here is the Arkansas Development Finance Authority sending \$50 million down there. Was the \$50 million plus interest repaid to ADFA? Right now we do not have any documentation as to whether it was ever repaid, we do not know what happened to it. Did the Arkansas Development Finance Authority make any other offshore deposits, and for what reasons?

Public documents show that ADFA was steering millions of dollars in bond underwriting business to Lasater and his company, who I said before was convicted for drug dealing.

Why would ADFA give all of this business to Lasater & Co. while Dan Lasater, the company's president, was under Federal investigation for narcotics trafficking?

The American people need to know the answers to these questions, and we are very, very concerned that Mr. Fiske may limit the investigation so that we never get the answers.

If somebody at the White House was involved in the laundering of drug money, then we should have a full accounting, it should be explained to this body and to the American people. And if there is no reason to believe that, then why does not the White House, Patsy Thomasson and everybody else come forward, Mr. Fiske, and give us the ability to investigate it so we can clear up this whole matter? If there is nothing to hide, they should not be concerned.

#### LET'S EXPAND FEDERAL HEALTH CARE TO INCLUDE ALL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot of talk about giving the American people the same type of health care that we here in Congress have available to us.

It seems that everybody is jumping on this band wagon. In fact, First Lady Hillary Clinton recently said:

Members of Congress are a lot of smart people. I have a great deal of respect for them in both parties. If they really believe that every American ought to have what they have, which is guaranteed health insurance, they can figure out how we can do it and afford to do it and delivery quality health care.

NBC's Brokaw:

So what you're doing, is charging Congress to deliver to the country what it has for itself.

Hillary:

That's right, I think that's only fair." [To Your Health, June 21].

Well, I can't say that I disagree with this concept because you see, Mr. Speaker, the Consumer Choice Health Security Act, the plan which I originally introduced last fall, does just that.

Our plan provides universal coverage. No new taxes and budget neutral. We are happy to see that the President and his wife have come around to our way of thinking.

I say this because the administration's plan, as introduced, would require all Americans to enroll in the Clinton plan's regional alliances, the large mandatory Government-sponsored health care purchasing cooperatives, Federal workers and Members of Congress would be able to keep their health benefits plans until at

least January 1998. It is noteworthy that the health care reform that is good enough for all other Americans is not good enough for Federal workers, including Members of Congress, until it has been tested on the rest of America first.

It is most unfortunate that I, along with my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee, will not have an opportunity to present our ideas and debate this issue fully in the committee.

The chairman has discharged the committee from fulfilling its obligation of formulating health care reform. Thus, members of the committee, which traditionally has been charged with this responsibility, will be shut out of the process. Not only has the legislation bypassed the subcommittee, which is the normal procedure, it will also bypass full committee.

This doesn't say much for working together in a bipartisan manner. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that Republicans have tried to work together and come up with a plan which we can all agree upon. The Rowland-Bilirakis bill is just one such example. I also believe our colleagues in the other body are also striving to make sure we end up with something upon which we can all agree.

I would have liked to have had the opportunity to present my bill, the Consumer Choice Health Security Act, in committee. My bill would provide health care by expanding the current Federal health program which would ensure that all Americans will have the same choice of plans available to them that we here in Congress currently enjoy.

It would provide the American people with a whole host of plans from which to choose. The key here is, or course, that we allow the consumer to make these choices for themselves, and not have the Federal Government take over this role.

The majority of the American people have indicated that they want to make their own choices about health care, especially the right to choose their own doctor.

Under this plan the consumer, not the employer, would own the plan and choose the benefits.

We have structured this legislation to provide health insurance coverage for all Americans in a revolutionary manner, through tax credits and medical savings accounts.

A major feature of the bill is that a refundable tax credit would replace the current exclusion available to households for company-sponsored health insurance. Employers would still be responsible for making payroll deductions equal to the premiums for the plan chosen by the employee and for sending that money to the plan. The employer would also have to adjust the employee's tax withholdings to reflect the estimated credit available to an employee.

I would like to emphasize that the consumer choice bill has no mandates on employers to provide health insurance. Employers must only give their employees the option of retaining their current benefits or cashing out their benefits and choosing another plan of their choice.

A 25-percent tax credit would also apply to medical-savings accounts. These medical-savings accounts, which can accrue interest tax

free, could be used to pay for medical expenses not covered by health insurance.

I believe that by combining these innovative approaches Americans will be empowered to make their own choices about health care.

#### THERE ARE TWO SIDES TO THE STORY IN HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make just a few comments because I know how deeply the gentleman cares about Haiti and that tragedy, and I feel also very deeply about Haiti and the tragedy.

But I think part of the problem is no one is quite sure what to do. It is easy to throw rocks and it is easy to scream at the administration, but I have not seen anybody here put a proposal on the table. I kind of think, before we attack, we should have some proposals to propose.

The gentleman was saying how terrible it was that we had stopped the relief flights going into Haiti because many were now starving. Well, I certainly am not for people starving anywhere. I agree with that.

But on the other hand, the gentleman also conceded that one of the reasons we stopped the relief flights was that the military was taking all the food and selling it on the black market.

Now, I think had we not stopped the relief flights, then people would have been attacking us because we were sending food into the military to sustain itself and the people who were starving would still be starving. Whether we sent in the relief food or not, the relief would have really been for the people in power more than for the people that we are really concerned about.

□ 1050

There has been great criticism about the number of Haitians getting on boats and coming here, and the great tragedy of that Nation is there has been a lot of people coming here for a very long time because it has not been able to build a viable economy, and part of it has been because it has had such miserable leadership at home, and many people felt they took power to line their own pockets rather than to help people. All of that we understand, and they are trying very hard to process the ones who are truly, truly political refugees suffering all sorts of torment and discrimination at home because of their politics and those who were just coming as economic refugees, and, as my colleagues know, they can condemn the United States for enforcing that law, but, if we just said every economic refugee in the world can come in here, I am not sure when we run out of space.

So, again they have tried to put a humanitarian policy in to prevent those who are being beaten, and battered, and tormented to come in, but those who were just coming because life would be better, we would like to do that, we would like to do that for everybody, but we cannot do that because at some point we run out of room, and we have got to worry about lives of Americans who are here.

So, Mr. Speaker, we hear all of these tough choices, and it is so very easy to criticize, and it is so very painful to look at the pictures. But then my question is:

What do people want us to do? Is it the policy of the gentleman who was here to invade Haiti?

I do not think Americans are prepared to do that. We tried that once, too, in this century, and, before we quickly sign up for that program, I think we better look at the results of the other time we tried it, and the results were not very positive, to be perfectly honest. We were there quite some time, it cost a lot of money, and really nothing got better in Haiti.

So, again all I want to say is I would like to see a bipartisan solution to this. I would like to see an American solution to this. I would like to see something we can all be proud of, or we never saw suffering children, or we never saw people trying to flee again, and we knew everything was solved in Haiti in a painless, bloodless way. I just do not know what that is, and I hope, if there is anyone in America who has an idea of what that is, they would come forward, because I think every American would like to see the same thing, but I do not think we get anywhere by attacking the administration, or attacking William Gray, who is the man trying to make some sense out of all of this, or saying that some people just do not care about the starvation. I think all of us care, and we care very deeply about the starvation and torment people are in. We just feel a little bankrupt in trying to figure out what to do.

We ran in to Somalia feeling very badly about all of that, and we found that it was a lot more complex than we thought, and we had gone into Haiti before, and we found that was more complex than we thought. So, let us try to come together and reason together to find a way rather than shout at each other, and I think we will get a lot further.

#### NAFTA—THE FIRST 6 MONTHS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I and several of our colleagues have taken time



out because today is a very important point for us. We mark today the first 6 months of implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Now there a year ago right now was a great deal of discussion here in the House and in the other body, and frankly there was a great deal of debate going on in this country over whether or not we should implement the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle regularly, and especially as members of the staff know here, stayed late at night to discuss whether or not we should implement the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and we all know that last fall, just before Congress adjourned on November 17, we had a very crucial vote here in the House, and by a very strong margin, Mr. Speaker, we passed the North American Free-Trade Agreement, something that had been envisioned since 1979 when Ronald Reagan first talked about it. It was an agreement that had been negotiated by President George Bush and was strongly supported by President Bill Clinton, demonstrating that we can, in a bipartisan way, work to create opportunities for U.S. export growth, and we can work together to bring down the barriers that tariffs pose for the free flow of goods and services.

Well, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly there were many people during that debate last year who predicted gloom and doom. They predicted the demise of the free world as we know it. They predicted that the U.S. economy would fail dramatically, and, in fact, we found the opposite to be the case. There are many people who are pointing to the fact that over the past 6 months we have enjoyed economic growth. Many like to argue that it is due to the policies that President Clinton has passed as it relates to domestic economic items here. Quite frankly, if my colleagues look at the economic growth which the United States economy has enjoyed, it is in large part due to exports and, of course, the increase in exports which we have seen to Mexico.

Now, Mr. Speaker, based on most analyses provided and the tragedies that we have witnessed in Mexico over the past 6 months, it would stand to reason that we would not have an increase in the flow of exports to Mexico, that in fact, even with the Chiapas rebellion, even with the very tragic assassination of Luis Donaldo Colosio, the presidential candidate of the Institutional Revolutionary Party, even with the economic turmoil which has existed in Mexico, we have seen, based on the data which we have received for the first 3 months of the year, exports to Mexico increased to a level of \$11.8 billion from January 1 through March of this year, and it seems to me that we need to realize that there has been

what we described often during the debate a win-win situation.

No one has worked harder on the issue of the North American Free-Trade Agreement than the gentleman from Tucson, AZ [Mr. KOLBE], my colleague. I had the great privilege of working with him and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] who I am going to call on in just a few moments, but first I am going to call on my great friend from Tucson.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for yielding, and I appreciate his leadership on this, as I do the gentlewoman from Colorado who is one of the really hard workers on her side of the aisle last fall in this debate over the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and I especially appreciate the fact that the gentleman from California has taken this hour to essentially report to the American people, a very preliminary report we would have to admit, but to report on the progress that we have made since the enactment of the North American Free-Trade Agreement and since it went into effect on January 1.

As the gentleman said, the preliminary data is very, very encouraging, and I think, as he said in his 1-minute teaser earlier this morning, he said that we would be talking about some of these figures and also reporting on some of the very specific cases that have been very successful.

Let me begin with kind of from the larger to the more specific, but the gentleman used a figure that, I think, is very, very important. He talked about exports to Mexico at a figure, at a rate, of over \$11 billion, almost \$12 billion in the first quarter. That translates on an annual basis into \$48 billion.

Now the first thing that strikes me about that is that that 15-percent increase, that is a 15-percent increase, and two important points, I think, need to be made. First, that 15-percent increase puts us very close to supplanting Japan with Mexico as our second largest trading partner. Almost certainly, if that rate continues next year, Mexico will be a larger trading partner than Japan is in terms of an export market for the United States goods, and that, of course, means jobs here at home exporting goods to a country like Mexico as it does to Japan.

□ 1100

The second thing is that that number, that 15 percent, if that holds good for the rest of this year is an increase.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, that 15 percent is the increase over the first 3 months of calendar year 1993, where we had already seen a tremendous surge in the level of exports that had taken place really since 1986 when privatization began. So exports were very positive in 1993, and we have

seen nearly a 15-percent increase since implementation of NAFTA during the first 3 months of 1994.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman is correct on that. That is what is important. You are looking at a 15-percent increase on top of what had been a very substantial increase in the year before.

When you take that, if you extrapolate that to the entire calendar year 1994, and we believe that there will be a 15-percent increase over the entire year, you are talking about in the first year, in the first year of NAFTA, creating about 128,000 additional jobs in the United States directly related to the exports to Mexico. Because every economist agrees that each billion dollars of exports translates into about 15,000 to 20,000 jobs here at home. So we are talking about 128,000 additional jobs. In the total labor market of the United States, that is not a huge amount. But it is an important addition when we are talking about finding new jobs and building an engine of economic growth.

Mr. DREIER. The important thing to note here is as we look at what sectors of the economy we have seen the increase in exports in, it has been in electrical, machinery, paper, trucks, cereals, and other areas like that, all items which have seen a decrease in that tariff barrier as they have sought to export to Mexico.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I think that the content of the exports is a very, very important factor.

Looking at another country, for example, in China, where we have a very substantial trade deficit, I think sometimes we miss the fact that there is a big difference between what we import from China, which is largely shoes, toys, some textiles, goods like that, consumer goods, and what we export to China, which is very large heavy equipment, aircraft, electronic goods, and equipment, software, computers, all of which are high-technology and require jobs at the very high end of the wage scale. So there is a very different content, job content, related to the exports versus imports. I know the gentlewoman from Colorado understands some of this.

Mr. DREIER. I would be happy to yield at this time to another person who worked with us in a bipartisan way to implement the North American Free-Trade Agreement, my very good friend from Denver, Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank both of you, because you worked awfully hard on your side of the aisle, and we worked hard over here. It is a very good idea that this be brought up just before we go home. Because when we come back, GATT is going to be front and center, and some of the horrible scenarios spun out on NAFTA are going to be spun out on GATT over and over again.

There seems to be a lot of people, unlike us, who do not believe American

business can compete and American business is as vibrant as we think it is. And the good thing about NAFTA is we have had this little display now to see that it did work, and we can expand it and we can go on, and it is exciting to see other countries such as Chile in the hemisphere wanting to have this expanded to them.

I think it is win-win. I think it is a good example of how the American people win, if all of us can kind of come together and figure out these solutions.

I thank you so much for being very courageous. I am sure on your side of the aisle it was not particularly popular to be working with the President of the United States.

Mr. DREIER. We loved every minute of it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. You were working for the United States, as we all were. There is a great feeling of satisfaction that we can stand here and say that all the naysayers will probably bring out their same tune and play it again, but we hope people look at the facts rather than get scared by it.

I wanted to join in and thank you both.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend very much for that helpful contribution. It is kind of you to note on our side we want to encourage a spirit of bipartisanship, contrary to some of the arguments we often hear made as debate ranges on a wide range of issues.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate the comments of the gentlewoman from Colorado because I think it does reflect the very strong bipartisan support that trade as an issue has in this body. We understand, those of us who advocate trade agreements, understand that trade is the engine of growth. Trade is really the future economic growth of this country.

In that light I wanted just to make a comment based on the thoughts that were contained in an article that was about this surge of exports to Mexico.

One of the officials of the AFL-CIO said well, yes, but. And the "but" was look at how much more Mexican exports to the United States have grown.

It is true that the first 3 months, while our exports grew 15 percent, the Mexican exports into this country grew 22 percent. But to say yes, but, about that—

Mr. DREIER. We have to remember there is still a trade surplus with Mexico. In the first 3 months of the year it is half a billion dollars. If you extrapolate that, that means for the entire year, we would have a surplus of \$2 billion.

Mr. KOLBE. One can almost say at the moment our trade is almost in balance. The point is that trade is not a win or lose situation. It does not mean that we are worse off because Mexico also got better off. We are better off by exporting 15 percent, or another \$3 billion to Mexico in the first quarter of

this year, and Mexico, of course, is better off. Frankly, American consumers benefit by the facts that tariffs have gone down and we have the option of buying goods and services from Mexico that were not available to us before, or were only available at a very high price.

I think that is an issue that often gets forgotten in this trade debate, that in a two way trade, it is the consumer that benefits by having access to imports.

Mr. DREIER. There is a perfect analogy which is extraordinarily timely, and I am excited that the American people are focusing on this issue. It is the World Cup.

Now, on the Fourth of July, Monday, in Palo Alto, CA, Brazil and the United States are going to be playing each other in the World Cup. Brazil and the United States are going to be the sole two teams on that field when the World Cup match is played.

Now, as we look at the issue of trade, there are people who like to say it is Mexico and the United States, and it is just the two of us. But we know that we live in a global economy, and in fact competition is wide ranging.

Now, as my friend pointed to the fact there has been a 22-percent increase in the level of imports from Mexico, we have got to realize that that is something that has come about in competition not just with Mexico, but with the rest of the world. And many of those items which we have purchased are items which would have come from China, Indonesia, Singapore, and other countries in Latin America.

So in the World Cup it would be, on the issue of trade, as if every single team in the World Cup was on the field playing, when in fact that is not the case when they are playing soccer. But in the global economy that we have today, that is the case.

So as we benefit the United States consumer by increasing the flow of items from Mexico to the United States, it is coming about because of that diminution of tariff or tax barriers which exists between the two countries.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman is correct. I think it is important to keep that point in mind, that the fact that there were these exports coming from Mexico to the United States did not mean that it diminished the United States production or United States jobs, that it supplanted United States production. It may have supplanted some of the production in another location, or, more importantly, it added to the total wealth within this country. It adds to the total wealth Americans have in terms of the products and services they are able to buy.

In the meantime, we are benefiting because we are exporting more to Mexico and exporting more to other countries.

Mr. DREIER. Many of our colleagues worked long and hard on the issue of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and we had, as we were saying earlier, bipartisan support. But among the freshman Members who just came to this Congress within the past 18 months, JAY DICKY stood out as one who worked long and hard, took time on special orders, worked diligently to convince a number of his freshman colleagues and others to support the North American Free-Trade Agreement. I am happy to yield at this time to my friend from Pine Bluff.

□ 1110

Mr. DICKY. I thank the gentleman from Claremont, CA.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited about NAFTA and what we are seeing as a result because of jobs. As I have been told, 20,000 U.S. jobs are created upon an increase of each \$1 billion in trade. We are estimating that in the year 1994 we are going to have a \$7 billion gain in trade in Mexico, or with Mexico, and therefore, we are going to have seven times 20,000 United States jobs that are created.

Mr. Speaker, some of this data that we have relates to various parts of our industry and exports. We have always been a supplier of United States-made motor vehicle body parts or radio and television parts to Mexico. Now, because of NAFTA, we can go and sell the completed car. The projection is from Ford Motor Corp. that they will export nearly 25,000 cars and trucks to Mexico this year, which is 23,300 more cars than they exported in 1993.

Wal-Mart of Arkansas, my home State, is going to provide 40 percent more United States-made products to its Mexican stores because of NAFTA. We also had the National Cotton Council of Memphis giving out a report for the first 3 months of this year, January through March, of an increase in cotton sales to Mexico to the tune of 62 percent.

This region includes Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Missouri. It makes up one-third of the Nation's cotton crop. We do not know what the others are doing, but we do know it is affecting us directly, particularly our farmers.

The livestock and poultry commission in our State of Arkansas also reports that the poultry products are well on their way to increased exportation to Mexico. We anticipate increases not only in raw products; namely, broilers, but also finished products, such as the chicken and the TV dinners and entrees, as the tariffs come down.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time for just a moment to underscore a very important item that my friend, the gentleman from Tucson, AZ, [Mr. KOLBE], and I both would like to point to, that is Wal-Mart, based in the gentleman's State, and the tremendous increase that we have seen in the number



of United States-produced goods that are being sold in Mexico. I should say that my friend, the gentleman from Tucson, and I on more than a few occasions had the opportunity to visit the largest Wal-Mart store in the world.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY] was on that visit when we visited the Wal-Mart store, and I know he would probably like to share some of what we saw there.

Mr. DICKEY. Absolutely. It was fantastic.

Let me tell you, if I may, what the Wal-Mart people tell me. They went down there thinking that the Mexicans would buy their products that they made a little better than they would buy United States-made products, so they put on the shelves the Mexican-made products, which supposedly were made in a cheaper fashion and they could reduce the prices.

They could not get those things off the shelves, so they started moving in American-made products, selling them at the same high volume, low discount rate, and they could not keep the American-made products on the shelves.

We saw that Wal-Mart that night. It was like an anthill, people everywhere. They seemed to know exactly what they were doing. It was a gigantic store and a tremendous, tremendous trophy to NAFTA.

Mr. DREIER. The figures from Wal-Mart are phenomenal. In this article, which was in *USA Today*, it says "Exports To Mexico Soar After NAFTA," and it has this amazing Wal-Mart figure in which it says "Wal-Mart has increased the percentage of United States-made products in its Mexican stores to 80 percent from 40 percent because," and Mr. Southerquist, the chief operating officer is quoted as saying, "that is what the shoppers there wanted, were American-made products," exactly what my friend, the gentleman from Pine Bluff, has said, so a doubling of the increase of United States-manufactured goods that are on the shelves in Mexico.

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] would yield, in the spirit of fairness and telling all the truth here, one of the problems we have had with NAFTA and the implementation has been trying to understand the new rules and regulations, in particular the new rules and regulations that have been imposed in Mexico on labeling.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I would acknowledge that this last week, just this last week, that the Wal-Mart store was closed very briefly by the Mexicans because of failure to adequately or properly label some of the products. That is one of the learning things we are going through, is learning how, what is required in terms of product labeling in Mexico. It is a new law down there, and there have been problems, I think we need to acknowledge.

The customs brokers tell me there have been problems trying to figure out new procedures for crossing at the border. All that is the learning process. It is the growing pains, if you will, of the new and growing trade relationship between our countries.

Mr. DICKEY. Let me finish just one paragraph.

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pine Bluff.

Mr. DICKEY. What I want to do is bring this into Arkansas, maybe Pine Bluff, AR. We produce soybeans in our area. We have been competing in the past with South America, which is a major soybean producing nation.

What is happening is that we are now able to provide Mexico with soybeans with no tariff, where the South American countries must pay the tariff. We have been given an advantage in southern Arkansas and eastern Arkansas, we have been given an advantage, because the tariffs from the other competing countries are still in place and we no longer have them.

I tell the Members, it is exciting. It is something that is really going to happen, and it is going to pay off. This effort that was made is going to pay off. I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], too.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we have been joined by one who voted "no" on the North American Free Trade Agreement, and I suspect may have seen the light. What he just said to me is that he wants to talk about the NAFTA in a positive way. I would be happy at this point to yield to my friend, the gentleman from San Diego, CA [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentlemen who are here, as they know, I represent the border area between California and Mexico. I did not vote "yes" for NAFTA, but it is vital to my constituents that NAFTA works. It is vital that we be part of economic growth and economic vitality.

I was pleased to hear the reports that the gentleman had today of some of the successes. I just wanted to make the Members aware that from my perspective sitting on the border, wanting to work with the Members to make it work, that we have to work to make sure that the infrastructure at the border is adequate to cover this advancing activity.

For example, as Members well know, much of the trade between the two nations is still carried on trucks, and about 50 percent of the trucks come through one border crossing in San Diego, the Otai Mesa border crossing. There is no interstate highway that connects that border crossing with the rest of the highway system in America. It is just a city street now that is very dangerous.

I have worked with the Committee on Public Works and Transportation to

get that road declared part of the National Highway System. We got a little bit of money this year to begin to move forward, but we need, I think, Mr. Speaker, to have an infrastructure fund specially for the advancement of NAFTA.

It is going to impose some burdens on our infrastructure, and if the successes that the gentleman has outlined here today continue, we are going to need that. This is a potential impediment. I hope to work with the gentleman to make sure that infrastructure is there.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely. I thank my friend, the gentleman from San Diego, CA [Mr. FILNER], for his contribution. I have visited the Otai Mesa, and obviously there are infrastructure problems that need to be addressed, but frankly, as we see the increase of the flow of goods and services, we also want to get to the root of the illegal immigration problem not only by enhancing the economy of Mexico so people do not have to flee across the border, but by improving that infrastructure. As the gentleman has said, we clearly will create a situation that can enhance the ability for goods and services to flow across the border.

Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I have strongly supported efforts to improve the infrastructure in that area, and am committed to doing everything that I possibly can to do that.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the gentleman. I think we can be brought together on the two things the gentleman has mentioned, the advance in economics and the decrease of illegal immigration.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for also realizing that NAFTA is going to be a win-win for both countries.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to further yield to my friend, the gentleman from Tucson, AZ [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], as well as others who may be listening to us here today, again before we get to some of the specifics that I think will be of interest to our listeners, to our Members, just some more macrodata.

□ 1120

KPMJ Peat, Marwick did a study not long ago, probably the most extensive study of American businesses about how they viewed NAFTA and what their response to it would be. They interviewed 1,036 business executives from mid-April to mid-May. They were all companies with gross revenues of at least \$10 million or more in the area of financial services, health care, information and communications, manufacturing, retailing and distribution industries.

Here are just a few of the things they said which I think are interesting, because these are the people on the front

line deciding whether they are going to do business in Mexico or how they are going to do so. First of all, 60 percent of them believed that it would improve the U.S. economy, and at the same time that it would provide stability to the Mexican economy. Sixty-six percent believe that it would help their companies expand in the rest of Latin America. Interestingly, 40 to 50 percent, in other words almost half already conducted preliminary research and have taken steps to hire personnel who speak Spanish in order to take advantage of this growing market.

Another couple of things are interesting. When asked where they plan to do their investment in the next year, 22 percent of them said Mexico. That is higher than any other country or region of the world. For example, 19 percent expected to do additional investment in Europe. Japan was only 9 percent.

So we have a tremendous market, it seems to me, in Mexico that has been demonstrated by the confidence that these American businesses have.

I would also just add one other little point. When asked would they move their business to Mexico or did they have any plans to do so, 86 percent said they had no plans whatsoever to move any of their production or business down to Mexico, but were hoping to take advantage of the growing markets down there. I think this information is useful information.

Mr. DREIER. That is very helpful. I appreciate the fact that my friend has pointed out the overwhelming support that is there and the successes which we have had.

One of the other items that was raised throughout the debate on the NAFTA was the issue of the political instability that exists in Mexico and the problems of six decades of one-party rule. One interesting assessment was provided by Nora Lustig who is an expert from the Brookings Institution. The point was made that in Mexico the fact that NAFTA was implemented helped to moderate the government's response to the Chiapas uprising and increase the pressure that the election, which we are going to be seeing on August 21, will be run in a fair and balanced way because there is a spotlight effect on Mexico.

There were many who argued that President Salinas and others in the Mexican Government were supporting the NAFTA and wanted to look as if they were improving the human rights situation and other problems that existed there just to get it through when in fact, as we look at the first 6 months, while there have been as we all acknowledge serious problems in Mexico, there has been that spotlight effect on Mexico, it does appear that as the world has looked at it things have improved. Based on most every assessment that has come out over the past

several months, we will see on August 21 a fair and balanced election.

My friend from Tucson is planning to be in Mexico for the election on August 21. I wonder if he might have some thoughts that he might like to share on that.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments and his question on that. I am hoping to be in Mexico during that time, if the schedule will permit, because I think it is very important that American political leaders see and understand the changes that are taking place in the Mexican political system.

As the gentleman has correctly pointed out, it has been a very dramatic change down there. In past elections there was the total machinery of the election in the hands of one party, the PRI. They have made so many changes to the election laws this year that you can hardly keep up with them. There are, for example, several limits on the spending so that all of the parties have equal access to the media markets. They also have equal access in terms of being able to raise funds.

The second thing that has been changed, and I think this is really very dramatic, is the new election rolls. They have been working on this for several years, but now every person has a card in their hand that guarantees them the right to vote, and they must have that card stamped, or they must have their finger stamped in order to vote. Once they do, they cannot vote again. That has been one of the problems in the past.

They are going to select their poll watchers, the people that run the polls in every little precinct, in every little village throughout Mexico, or every little suburban area in Mexico City, they are going to be selected randomly by a draw from the registered voters in that particular voting district, or as we would say in this country, precinct. So there is no way that one party gets an advantage over the other. They are going to select them randomly.

As proof I think of their strong desire to have a free and open election, the Mexicans are bending over backwards to invite foreign observers to see this election take place. In fact, I think they are hoping that the foreign observers will help to make sure that honesty is the byword of this election. So for a country that in the past has seen having foreign observers there as an infringement on their sovereignty, they are going to the other extreme, if you will, and inviting literally thousands of observers to come to that country. I have urged them for years to do this and said, look, we invite people to our elections from every country all over the world to come over and see how we do it. Maybe you can learn something from our elections, and we might learn something from the way

Mexico has conducted this election. It is certainly going to be among the most modern in terms of technology in the world, and it far exceeds anything that we do in this country in terms of their polling lists, and the modernity and the updating of their polling lists and how updated they are. It is going to be a very technically oriented election, and I think we can probably learn something.

There are three candidates, as the gentleman knows, and at the moment two of them, that is the government party candidate, the PRI which has been the presidency for the last 60 years in Mexico is running narrowly or slightly ahead of the candidate of PAN, which is the more free enterprise oriented party, the National Action Party. On the other side, the Democrat Revolution Party, the PRD, is, of course, led by Mr. Cardenas and that party is running very much third right now.

Mr. DREIER. A very distant third.

Mr. KOLBE. A very distant third. They are going to be the ones, of course, that will raise all of the questions and the charges about dishonesty in the election.

I think what is the real news is that the PAN is running as close as they are today to the PRI.

Mr. DREIER. What we often heard throughout the debate on the NAFTA was that there was a strong opposition within Mexico to the NAFTA, the two parties which are almost neck and neck, very close at the top, way ahead of the PRD candidate, Mr. Cardenas both strongly supported implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and those candidates are the ones who have gained the largest support base within Mexico.

Mr. KOLBE. That is correct. And the PAN, the National Action Party, was very quick to support the concept of NAFTA. For years they have been arguing for a more open and freer trade, and they were very, very quick in responding to that.

So in fact it is very hard today to distinguish between the PRI, the government party, the Party Revolutionary Internationale and the PAN, the National Action Party and their economic policies. So both of them are strong advocates of more open markets, freer trade and capitalism in Mexico, which I think is a very clear signal to the rest of the world of the economic direction of Mexico.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we have spent the last 40 some odd minutes talking about the wide range of issues and concerns that were raised on this whole issue of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, ranging from the question of exports versus imports, the political situation, the problems that Mexico has faced, which we all acknowledge are still there.



□ 1130

I think that as we look at this issue we should take the next few minutes to be very specific about some of the marvelous success stories that exist as it relates to the NAFTA.

Now, as we all know, some of the most virulent opponents to the North American Free-Trade Agreement stated as that debate raged last year that we would see the economies in the Rust Belt of the country devastated if NAFTA were to be implemented, all of the jobs because of businesses flowing to Mexico would be evaporating, and they said to people like the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and to me that, "Yes, you come from the Western part of the United States, your States border Mexico, and you will have real improvement. But the rest of the country will pay the price from the implementation of the NAFTA."

So I would like to take a couple of minutes to start out by pointing to a few successes that exist in Ohio.

Now, we know that some of the strongest opposition came from Members of the Ohio delegation, and for starters, as we look at the first 6 months, the headline of this article, "Chrysler Starts Shipping Jeeps To Mexico." In January, Chrysler began shipping its first Jeeps to Mexico. The company will ship about 3,800 Jeep Wranglers and Cherokees to Mexico from its Toledo, OH, plant in 1994, thanks in part to lower tariffs as a result of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, that's in an article in the *Journal of Commerce*.

The Jeep sales have also benefited suppliers to Chrysler who are spread throughout that region.

Then there is an article in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, "Axle Maker Sees Silver Lining From Jeep Exports." With the export of nearly 4,000 United States-made Jeeps to Mexico, Toledo-based Dana Corp. now has to produce more axles for the popular vehicles. The chairman of the Dana Corp. indicated in December of 1993 that the company may even close its plants in Mexico and bring business back to the United States. Now, that is a little different than what we heard last year during this debate on the NAFTA.

Then if you look also in Ohio, Cougar and Thunderbird production moves from Mexico to Ohio. The Ford Motor Co. announced in January that it plans to shift production of its Cougars and Thunderbirds from Mexico to Lorain, OH. Ford plans to build an additional 8,000 Thunderbirds and Cougars this year in Lorain using current workers on overtime. A Ford spokesperson, who credits the NAFTA for the production move, said the company may also move its production for the Grand Marquis from Mexico to the United States. The company is holding to its assurance that NAFTA would create, not eliminate, U.S. jobs, and plans to hire 550

workers as it realigns its North American operations.

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentleman will yield further, there is more in the automobile market. As a matter of fact, many of us argued during the course of the NAFTA debate that one of the first and greatest beneficiaries was going to be the automobile industry, because the most excluded product that we make in the United States, from the Mexican market, has been automobiles. That is because of what they call the auto pact that requires that for every car that is imported into Mexico, two have to be exported, and any car that is imported has such horrendous tariffs on, it made it impossible. What the companies were forced to do was go down there and build their production plants in Mexico in order to produce.

Now we are going toward a rationalization. We are seeing astonishing results immediately, even though it is not for 10 years until all the tariffs and restrictions on imports of autos come off.

Here is what happened with Chrysler and the export of Intrepids, Dodge Intrepids, to Mexico. This year they are going to export about 2,500 Dodge Intrepids from their Newark, DE, plant to Mexico. Now, that does not seem like an awful lot, but it is an awful lot when you think that last year they exported exactly eight, eight Dodge Intrepids which were sent to Mexico. They are going from 8 to 2,500. That is in the first year.

Each year those tariffs continue to come down. Each year the number of imports allowed into Mexico continues to go up, so there is going to be a tremendous boom, I believe, in that market. You are looking at 90 million people down there, a growing middle-class market in Mexico. There is a tremendous opportunity.

That is just what you cited, as with Jeep, as one example, and that is just another one. There are others in the area.

Mr. DREIER. We have this litany of pages. If you look further in Ohio, Goodyear Tire hiring in Ohio due to Mexico trade; export consultants swamped by NAFTA interests; machinery producer sees gains in Mexican market. These are all items that have been in Ohio.

Then in Michigan, and you may recall there were more than a couple of our colleagues from Michigan who often stood in the well and spoke in opposition to the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

The headline and report for the Joint Automotive Governmental Action Council, and we have mentioned Chrysler, we have mentioned Ford. "GM auto exports to Mexico booming under the NAFTA." "Dow Chemical projects \$34 million growth in exports to Mexico just in 1994."

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentleman will yield again, back on automobiles again, here in Indiana, a company called MascoTech, Inc., and actually it is a Michigan-based company, but they have bought a new plant in North Vernon, IN, to produce auto parts for the Mexican market, a huge, huge market in Mexico for automobile parts. They are going to be building wheel covers, spoilers, luggage racks, battery protectors that will be going to Ford and Chrysler plants in Mexico. They expect to sell some 4 million parts, auto parts, from its North Vernon facility to the two auto makers by 1995, all, 100 percent of it, due to the increased business with Mexico.

Mr. DREIER. I am originally from the "Show Me" State. In fact, I am going to be spending some time there next week.

As I look at Missouri, I look at a company with which I have been very familiar over the years based in Kansas City, MO, called Butler Manufacturing Co.

Their firm is a supplier of specialty components, nonresidential construction services, and they project that their total orders will rise by 27 percent in the Mexican market. Part of the reason for the growth is that under NAFTA, Butler can charge its clients lower prices. Mexico's import duties on construction materials fell from 15 percent to zero under NAFTA, a benefit it can pass to its customers.

Back in the United States, Butler is already increasing its engineering staff and expanding its manufacturing shifts to respond to increased production.

And then another headline that was in the *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch* just a couple of months ago, "Chrysler Picks Missouri, Not Mexico, As Site For The Ram Production." I guess that is one of their automobiles, I guess, the Chrysler Ram. I am not too familiar with that one. Obviously they are selling in Mexico, and they are being manufactured right here in the United States.

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentleman will yield further, one case that includes my own State of Arizona is Honeywell. Honeywell, of course, is based in Minneapolis.

Mr. DREIER. I thought we were not going to talk about our own home States here.

Mr. KOLBE. It is not my home district, because they are located in the Phoenix area, but Honeywell expects to increase sales to Mexico 60 percent in 1994; with NAFTA's more open government buying rule, they expect to sell more of the TDC 3,000 process control systems which are built in Phoenix to the Mexican oil company, and that is Petroleos Mexicanos, or PEMEX. They are also selling other equipment that is made in Albuquerque, made in Arlington Heights and Freeport, IL, so very important gains there.

We have been talking a lot about big companies, Chrysler, Ford, and Dow and Honeywell.

Little companies are benefiting, too. Let me just suggest a couple of them. One in San Rafael, CA, Panamax—

Mr. DREIER. Thanks for covering California for me. I appreciate it.

Mr. KOLBE. They are a small designer and manufacturer of surge protectors for high-technology electronics equipment. They have added 15 to 18 employees just to meet the NAFTA-generated sales this year. They have added a bilingual sales staffperson to handle the calls from Mexico and Latin America.

That, by the way, is a phenomenon we are seeing all over the country, and putting a tremendous demand on individuals graduating from high schools and universities that have language capabilities that can do business in English as well as in Spanish. So there is a tremendous need there. In fact, the language firm, just one other, and I will give the floor back to my good friend from California, called the Language Solution, a Burbank-based language instruction services firm, it is reaping the benefits of increased trade with Mexico. It opened an office last year in El Paso, to teach Spanish to local U.S. Government and business personnel. It has already won a contract with the local gas company as well as several other U.S. companies that have border operations, border facilities.

It is selling more of its business in Albuquerque, where firms are asking for language-trained individuals. So there is an example of the spinoff of NAFTA in another area of language, a firm that is devoted specifically to that.

And the list goes on and on, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. DREIER. And it is going to go on and on right here, and to be even-handed, I am going to talk about Florida. In Florida, and this was in the NAFTA News on April 25, Medical Equipment Maker Sees Jump In Sales To Mexico. Fort Pierce-based DeVilbiss/Pulsair, a medical equipment manufacturer, has seen exports to Mexico skyrocket over the last 2 years. The company expects sales to grow even faster under the NAFTA, which cut Mexican tariffs on medical equipment. Pulsair expects 1994 sales of over 2,000 units, according to company vice-president Mark Novak, and here is what he said: "With NAFTA's lower tariffs, market activity will increase, and sales have no way to go but up."

□ 1140

Having said that, having referred to Florida, I yield to my very good friend, the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Member from Laverne, CA.

Mr. Speaker, in fact there is other good news in Florida, success stories about Florida manufacturing that have worked out very well. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for taking this time. We are fulfilling a promise here, and I appreciate their leadership. We promised we would watch the situation with NAFTA very closely and that we would issue progress reports from time to time.

I think that a lot of us took NAFTA a little bit on faith, the faith that American business can compete and win, and in fact that is exactly what is happening. We are being justified.

I want to congratulate Mr. DREIER and Mr. KOLBE for their continued leadership, meeting the obligation, and satisfying the promises to keep monitoring and reporting back. I have to say that there are still some problems in some sectors, as Mr. DREIER knows and we have talked about. We are working them out. We are getting good response to work out problems with the tomato growers, for the child labor laws, pesticides and things like that. Progress is being made in troubled areas and success is being made in other areas.

I would also like to say that someday I hope we are going to be able to have other markets as well. Places like Haiti come to mind. If the gentleman would indulge me for about 10 seconds, I heard the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], who participated in this earlier, who referred to Haiti, saying it is a shame that we do not have other options for the situations in Haiti. I think she was referring to the somewhat critical statements I made earlier in the morning.

In fact, we do have other options for Haiti than the administration's policy. Apparently the gentlewoman has forgotten that we have a safe haven solution that involved no embargo, provided humanitarian relief, and did not call for an invasion.

So, either the gentlewoman has forgotten, simply forgotten, or as a member of the Armed Services Committee she was absent from the debate, but I do not think that is correct. So we have had concrete solutions offered that are better. And I hope those solutions will lead to better opportunity for NAFTA to come to Haiti and other places like that where they will profit and will profit.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. My friend is absolutely right. I thank him for his contribution and the diligent and very responsible way in which he has been dealing with the wide range of issues that affect this hemisphere. I know that he as a Floridian has been working specifically on the issue of Haiti. He underscores what truly is a goal of ours—that is, to create a hemispherewide free trade zone so

that we can witness the free flow of goods and services throughout this hemisphere. I think that is a very important item which would again create a win-win situation.

I would like to point to one more item, since I have had an 11:30 appointment that I have stood up so far. The person with whom I have the appointment and was scheduled to meet happens to be from Connecticut. So I thought maybe I should point to one of the success items in Connecticut, and then I would further yield to my friend from Tucson. This is correspondence from a company based in Norwalk, Connecticut, named Perkin-Elmer. They are, as I said, based in Norwalk. They report that they have sold \$550,000 in water quality analysis equipment to Medico under NAFTA. The company has sold \$250,000 worth of atomic absorption spectrometers and \$150,000 worth of gas chromatographs to Mexico's regional water laboratories. The firm has also sold an \$80,000 inductively coupled plasma emission spectrometer and a \$70,000 gas chromatography mass spectroscopy system to the City Water Laboratory in Juarez. I wonder how they translate that in Spanish. Each sale also involves repeat business because the machines require replacing consumable equipment, such as light sources.

That came out in an article just about 6 weeks ago on a success in Connecticut.

I further yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was stumbling somewhat over those scientific terms. I do not know how it is translated into Spanish. I am not sure how the reporter is going to get it quite into the record here. But I know the gentleman has scientific background, and he knows it all and uses those terms correctly.

Mr. DREIER. If I may interject, one of my best friends is a spectroscopist.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman points out correctly that a lot of this is very high-technology scientific equipment that we are selling and a lot of it is also services.

Let me also, in concluding my remarks here, mention one or two other items.

I think it is interesting that Ace Hardware is planning to build a \$26 million paint manufacturing facility in Texas as a result of NAFTA. They have reported their sales grew by 125 percent in the first 2 months of this year as a result of taking the tariff off. I think that is one of the products where the tariff comes off immediately, 100 percent of the tariff is reduced there. That is paint sales. They now have more than 1,000 jobs in the United States supported by sales in Mexico. They hired 25 workers in just the past couple of months to serve Mexico. All of these



have been hired since the passage of NAFTA.

But it is not just manufacturing. There are services which I want to mention.

Integrated Cargo Management Systems, in San Antonio, produces high-technology services for monitoring of trucks and cargo. They signed a letter with Mexico's Radio Beep SA de CV. That is the largest paging and messaging company in Mexico. They signed for the exclusive distribution rights. That is an example of the kind of thing that can happen with the passage of NAFTA.

Let me finally just mention an insurance firm in Mississippi, Jackson-based U.S. Life Insurance Co. recently received approval from the Mexican Government to participate in the Mexican reinsurance market. That is a brand-new area that the United States have been excluded from entirely in the past, in the insurance and reinsurance market. There is a huge opportunity for U.S. firms. These are just a couple of examples. Let me, as I close my thoughts here, remember that we are really not talking just about names of firms, we are not talking about sales and dollars, we are talking about human beings, jobs, good jobs for Americans, for American men and women and for their families. That is what trade is all about. I know my good friend from California shares that vision of trade as the engine of growth for the United States, and that is why we work so hard to make sure that NAFTA becomes a reality. And I think that is why we stand here today with some justifiable pride and certainly some satisfaction, knowing that the efforts we put forth have literally, literally led to the creation of thousands of new jobs here in the United States for American workers. I know he is going to be a leader as he has been in the past on NAFTA. He was on NAFTA and he will be a leader in making sure that we have a good GATT agreement, and GATT-implementing legislation.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend very much for the leadership role he has played in this issue of the NAFTA and will continue to work closely together on the MFN with China and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the wide range of trade issues which, as he said, create opportunities to benefit not only workers in this country but also the consumers who do see a real plus from the issue of free trade.

Things are not perfect in this arrangement with Mexico and the United States. You will recall the package is to be phased in over a long period of time, 15 years. We are hopping to reduce that total phase-in period. We know there are very serious problems that continue to exist in Mexico today.

But having said that, it is very clear from what we have discussed over the past hour and other evidence that has come forward the preponderance of information that has been provided demonstrates that breaking down tariff barriers, as was done with the North American Free-Trade Agreement, is a win-win situation. There is no benefit for the United States of America to have a poor southern neighbor. We want to help lift the economies throughout the world and we want to do it not with dramatically increasing, taking U.S. taxpayer dollars through foreign aid, but instead through trade. And that really is the key to growth in the United States and in the other countries.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to extend best wishes to our friends and colleagues, all those who work here in the Congress, for the next 10 days as we embark on our Independence Day district work period.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 3800, ENVIRONMENTAL INSURANCE RESOLUTION AND EQUITY ACT 1994, AND H.R. 2448, RADON AWARENESS AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1993

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 3800) to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes, and a report on the bill (H.R. 2448) to improve the accuracy of radon testing products and services, to increase testing for radon, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, this request has certainly been cleared with the minority side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

□ 1150

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE HEALTH CARE IN RURAL AREAS

(Ms. LAMBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Speaker, for the last 4 years I have been traveling through the 25 counties of Arkansas' First Congressional District talking with the people about what they really need to improve their health care in rural Arkansas. I have talked with mothers who have to drive hundreds of miles across county lines to deliver ba-

bies because there are no obstetricians near their home, or their HMO only contracts with a hospital that is 200 miles away.

I have talked with small town doctors who pay triple the costs for repairs on their medical machines, x-rays and other things, and they pay triple the costs for supplies like film because they work in isolated areas and serve the people of Arkansas' First Congressional District. And I have talked to parents of chronically ill children who could not get their children the care they needed because their HMO's did not cover specialized treatment like pediatric cardiologists.

Now the time for talking is over. It is time for action. I am pleased to introduce today three bills that will bring doctors to rural areas that will help to keep them there, and will more adequately reimburse the cost of serving in rural areas, and, hopefully, improve delivery of services to chronically ill children.

Mr. Speaker, my fear is that in these confusing discussions of health care reform that rural concerns will get left out or simply the short end of the stick. Insurance for all people does not mean a lot in rural communities if we do not have doctors or health care providers there and if they cannot get the type of treatment that they need. These bills will answer the call of the people of the rural areas of this Nation and in Arkansas' First Congressional District.

#### FINDING A REMEDY TO THE CARBONE DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support bipartisan legislation I, along with others, have introduced, H.R. 4661, to ensure the protection of flow control authority for those local and State governments that rely on it for the implementation of long-term, integrated, environmentally sound municipal solid waste management plans.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely clear that without this flow control option, recycling, composting, source reduction, resource recovery programs, waste-to-energy and other environmental projects to manage municipal solid waste in communities across the United States will be seriously endangered. Indeed, it is fair to say that in the aftermath of the Carbone decision, which has overnight eliminated this important local government tool, the momentum toward increased recycling, composting, and source reduction will not only come to a halt but could be significantly reversed, undoing all the progress we have made over the last

decade. As Justice Sandra Day O'Connor noted in her concurring opinion, it is within Congress' power to authorize local imposition of flow control. I urge my colleagues to move legislation that would ensure localities continued use of and investment in innovative and environmentally sound solid waste management systems.

Mr. Speaker, some who claim to be concerned about the negative environmental impact of the Carbone decision are suggesting a narrow grandfather of exact facilities already built. I believe that could prove to be short sighted and environmentally regressive. It would freeze in current technology, making it more difficult to finance new technology for recycling, composting, resource recovery and source reduction. Accordingly, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 4661, that grandfathers solid waste management plans that are predicted on waste flow control. My bill enables communities that rely on waste flow control to pursue those plans and for those communities that do not have such plans, they may proceed pursuant to the new guidelines established in the bill.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we need to fully understand and appreciate this: the Carbone decision and other similar court cases place many planned and existing recycling and composting facilities in jeopardy.

To underscore this concern, let me point to some places across the country where composting and related environmental projects are at risk absence of flow control legislation like H.R. 4661.

The city of Springfield, MO, has decided to open to \$17.9 million recycling and composting facility—referred to as a materials recovery facility [MRF]—the funding of which requires a bond issue. After the decision to build the facility was made, however, local waste haulers purchased landfills outside the city limits. They then began transporting 75 percent of the city's waste to these landfills, thereby jeopardizing the city's chances for a bond issue. The waste hauler's landfills do not, of course, incorporate source reduction or recycling into their waste disposal programs. In contrast, the city's plan, which now stands in jeopardy due to the actions of the local waste haulers, incorporates recycling, source reduction, public education, and the removal of household chemicals from the waste stream.

The city of San Diego's municipal solid waste composting project, Cape May County, New Jersey's municipal solid waste composting project, and Rockland County New York's recycling facility are all in similar situations. Each local government has planned an environmentally sound recycling or composting facility as part of an integrated solid waste management plan. Each one must now put implementa-

tion of its recycling or composting facilities as well as its entire integrated solid waste plan on hold as a result of its inability to use flow control in the wake of the Carbone decision.

Similarly, Fresno, CA, is in the planning phase of its municipal solid waste composting project. Under the California State "Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989," California communities are required by law to divert 50 percent of their waste from landfills by the year 2000. In order to comply with this mandate, San Diego built the waste recovery facility at issue. Plans for this facility will also be put on hold.

Riverside County, CA, is in the final permitting stages for their planned recycling facility, a facility which would allow the county to avoid landfilling a significant portion of their waste in compliance with California law. These plans will now be put on hold as a result of the Carbone decision.

The Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority operates two recycling facilities that are absolutely dependent on flow control. Connecticut Attorney General Richard Blumenthal recently described the impact the Carbone decision will have on his State. He told the press that "as a direct and immediate result" of the Carbone decision, "many (Connecticut) municipalities, and ultimately their taxpaying citizens will find themselves liable for huge payments in lieu of garbage which they can no longer supply." As Blumenthal notes, it is ironic that Connecticut municipalities find themselves in this position because Connecticut complies with Federal mandates requiring long range planning for solid waste disposal and recycling. The State of Connecticut could ultimately be liable for \$520 million in State revenue bonds.

San Diego County recently began commercial operation of a \$134 million waste recovery facility which recovers recyclable from the waste stream. In order to comply with California State mandate, San Diego built the waste facility at issue. The fate of this facility, which depends on flow control, is uncertain in the wake of the Carbone decision.

In my own district, one county, Mercer County, issued and spent \$71 million in revenue bonds for the construction and implementation of a state-of-the-art comprehensive solid waste management system which incorporates many environmental programs. Its solid waste management system includes comprehensive recycling, leaf and yard waste composting, household hazardous waste collection, an aggressive consumer education program, resource recovery and landfilling. Similarly, Atlantic County has a comprehensive solid waste management system that includes composting of municipal waste, including leaf and yard waste, a comprehensive recycling

program, including curb-side collection of batteries and other items, household hazardous waste collection and an aggressive consumer education program.

By employing comprehensive waste management systems, the counties eliminate the need to send significant portions—often over 50-percent—of their waste streams to waste disposal facilities. Under Mercer County's comprehensive recycling program, which includes curbside collection of recyclable materials including wood, paper, plastic, glass, steel, aluminum, bi-metallic, newsprint, batteries, tires, and aseptic containers, last year 63 percent of the county's municipal solid waste was recycled.

In addition to the many environmental projects employed by Mercer and Atlantic Counties, the two counties have agreed to jointly operate a regional resource recovery facility, scheduled to begin construction on July 31, 1994. As a result of the Carbone decision and the counties' inability to use flow control in the absence of Federal legislation authorizing its use, both counties' entire comprehensive solid waste management systems—and the \$71 million in revenue bonds used to fund the Mercer County system—are in jeopardy. As a result, not only is the construction of this regional facility placed in jeopardy, but so are the numerous aggressive and effective environmental programs currently run by the counties.

Burlington County, in my district, faces a similar situation regarding its proposed sewage sludge composting plant. The plant is estimated to cost \$70 million and the County has already borrowed \$46 million from the State wastewater trust. However, financing is based on the assurance that sewage sludge from all 40 municipalities in Burlington County would be treated at the plant. Without this guaranteed revenue, the county may be forced to accept sludge from outside the county—thus breaking a longstanding promise to Burlington residents—or hike disposal fees which would inevitably mean higher local property taxes.

Situations similar to those I have just described also exist in Snohomish County, WA, Brookhaven, NY, Lancaster County, PA, Beaumont, TX, and in many other localities throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, under Federal law, these State and local governments, as well as many more, are presupposed by the Federal Government to have the responsibility for managing municipal solid waste. As part of this responsibility, local governments have developed and implemented integrated municipal solid waste management plans. In many instances recycling or other environmental programs are mandated by local governments as part of their disposal of MSW. In other instances, local governments choose, often based



on public demand, to implement recycling and other environmentally responsible programs such as composting, source reduction, household hazardous waste collection, and public education to deal with municipal solid waste. Local governments use flow control ordinance to implement the long-term integrated solid waste plans required of them and to fulfill their responsibility to protect the public health and safety by providing adequate long-term disposal capacity. To change the rules now, would be patently unfair and wreak havoc on environmentally safe and publicly approved waste management plans across the country.

When a locality implements a fully-integrated solid waste management system that includes components such as recycling, composting, waste-to-energy facilities, landfills and public education, flow control allows the locality to fund these components through the collection of tipping fees at the municipal solid waste landfill and/or waste-to-energy facility which are parts of the system.

Often times large private haulers compete for only a portion—or the cheapest aspect—of the complete plan leaving it to the taxpayers to pay for the nondisposal costs of the system, such as the costs of recycling, composting, source reduction and public education program. Unlike local governments who are required to act in the public interest, private waste companies often overlook the long-term environmental benefits and focus on their prime interest: making money through the cheapest disposal means. Such profit motives create disincentives for the employ of recycling, resource conservation and recovery technologies, which are invariably more expensive, when you do not factor in their obvious long-term benefits to the community and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, there is a consensus that our local governments have the responsibility to provide for the safe and sanitary disposal of municipal solid waste over the long-term. Yet, Congress must ensure that local governments have the explicit authority to: first, pursue environmentally safe avenues of recycling, composting, and disposal as components of their integrated solid waste management plans and, second, to cost effectively finance such activities through guaranteeing adequate waste streams to their waste management facilities to ensure that they receive sufficient revenues to meet their bond obligations. One of the most equitable and progressive ways to accomplish these two objectives is to ensure that municipalities who have enacted flow control programs are permitted to carry them out.

In my own State of New Jersey we have required each of our 21 counties to develop their own waste flow and man-

agement plans so that our State will become self-sufficient in our management of garbage disposal and no longer export our trash. All around the country, in more than 25 States, State and local governments have taken the initiative and are developing environmentally responsible integrated systems for the management of waste. All of their efforts, as well as their financial and environmental health, are now at risk if Congress remains silent on the flow control issue. I therefore strongly urge my colleagues to support my legislation which restores flow control authority to those local governments that have planned for it. Those of us who are environmentally concerned about solid waste reduction and preserving our open spaces through increased recycling and other means must vigorously support enactment of this comprehensive measure.

Outline of the provisions of H.R. 4661:  
THE WASTE FLOW CONTROL ACT OF 1994 (H.R. 4661)

Grandfather for States and political subdivisions that have relied on flow control:

(A) Allows continued flow control for residential, commercial, incinerator ash, construction or demolition debris, industrial, institutional waste, if adopted before May 15, 1994 (date of *Carbone* decision);

(B) Protects source separation and recycling programs, if adopted before May 15, 1994;

(C) Protects all ordinances, laws, contracts, administrative/legislative provisions, including solid waste management plans, adopted before May 15, 1994; and

(D) Protects all existing and planned facilities.

Clearly states that waste flow control is a reasonable regulation of commerce, retroactive to the effective date of the contract or agreement or date of adoption of any law, ordinance, regulation, legislative/administrative provision.

Congressional grant of authority to States for prospective waste flow control:

(A) Gives States and qualified political subdivisions permission to flow control residential waste, including:

- (1) from a single or multifamily residence;
- (2) from an apartment or condominium; or
- (3) from a hotel or motel.

(B) Gives States and qualified political subdivisions authority to control destination of recyclables, if:

- (1) the materials are relinquished voluntarily; or
- (2) the State or qualified political subdivision assumes responsibility for the materials.

(C) Allows the designation of waste management facilities.

Contingencies for prospective waste flow control:

(A) State or political subdivision must establish a source separation program for recycling, reclamation, and reuse.

(B) Designation process for waste management facilities must include 1 or more public hearings and a written explanation.

Competitive bidding process for prospective waste flow control:

(A) Designation process must be a part of a long-term municipal solid waste management strategy.

(B) Goals of the designation process must at least include:

- (1) capacity assurance;
  - (2) provisions to protect human health and environment; and
  - (3) additional goals determined to be relevant to State or qualified political subdivision.
- (C) Identifies/compares reasonable and available alternatives.
- (D) Provides for public participation and comment.
- (E) Provides for an open competitive process for designation, including:
- (1) in writing, criteria to be utilized in selection;
  - (2) opportunity for private and public persons to offer their existing or proposed facilities; and
  - (3) use of the merits of the facilities in selection.

Protects State procurement laws and Federal and State environmental standards relating to the disposal or management of solid waste or recyclables.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 263. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses.

□ 1659

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. KANJORSKI] at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.

## WAIVER OF BUDGET RULES FOR FREE-TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen rightly refers to the impending results of the Uruguay round of GATT as a "huge global tax cut" amounting to nearly \$750 billion over the next decade. Second, Trade Representative Mickey Kantor says it is the most substantial elimination of trade barriers in the history of GATT.

Mr. Speaker, this Member could not agree more. The Uruguay round trade agreement of GATT would accomplish both of these remarkable achievements.

Unfortunately Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration seems determined

to jeopardize these two achievements by refusing to waive strict budget rules which cripple our ability to implement the recently negotiated GATT agreement.

These budget rules require either more taxes or spending cuts to offset the estimated \$11.5 billion in Federal Government revenue that is cut by the GATT agreement's proposed reductions in tariffs over 5 years. The Federal Government collects these tariffs on a variety of goods imported to the United States. U.S. consumers ultimately pay these tariffs in the price of the imported goods.

Mr. Speaker, economists almost unanimously agree that a direct waiver of the budget rules could be justified so that additional taxes or spending cuts are not required to make up the loss of Federal revenue from tariff reductions under GATT. These economists correctly argue that increased trade and economic activity resulting from GATT would immediately stimulate more corporate and individual Federal tax revenues. These increased Federal tax revenues would clearly exceed the Federal revenues lost from tariff reductions.

Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration is jeopardizing these two remarkable achievements by proposing to raise taxes on a variety of industries which have little nexus to the trade agreement. For example, the administration has proposed imposing taxes on broadcasters for their use of the electromagnetic spectrum. Clearly, these broadcasters have little to gain from increased trade among member nations of GATT. Therefore, forcing them to pay for GATT really makes no sense—it is just a search for revenue.

Additionally Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leon Panetta has recently jeopardized agricultural support for the Uruguay round trade agreement by saying agriculture would only have to sacrifice approximately \$1.7 billion of the agricultural budget to help pay for the cost of implementing the GATT accord.

Mr. Speaker, during the Uruguay round of the GATT talks the United States negotiated with other grain subsidizing nations and agreed to reduce its agricultural export subsidies by approximately \$1.7 billion—the amount Mr. Panetta says agriculture owes; but, the United States agricultural industry did not agree during the negotiations to permit these funds to disappear from the agricultural budget. Unfortunately, the administration has wrongly linked these two different items out of misplaced convenience and is thereby using the GATT implementing legislation to do an "end run" around the House Agriculture and Appropriations Committees.

Fortunately Mr. Speaker, at least 21 Members of Congress led by Representative TOM EWING have the courage to advocate a straightforward budget

waiver for the GATT agreement and do what makes sense. Representative EWING's legislation, H.R. 4198, would permit us to avoid our current and future predicaments by waiving budget rules for the implementation of all free-trade agreements. Certainly it is appropriate at least for the revenue-positive GATT agreement from the Uruguay round.

Mr. Speaker, the Journal of Commerce and the Wall Street Journal agree; a waiver of the budget rules is absolutely justified because increased Federal revenues from increased corporate and individual income tax proceeds springing from greater trade generated by GATT will greatly exceed the Federal revenues lost by tariff reductions. Therefore, this Member urges his colleagues to cosponsor the Ewing legislation to waive budget rules for free-trade agreements and support U.S. trade.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEARNS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUDDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,020.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2155. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for the Federal share of the cost of the construction of a Forest Ecosystem Research Laboratory at Oregon State University in Corvallis, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 263 of the 103d Congress, the House stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, July 12, 1994.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 263, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 12, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3454. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army—Installations, Logistics, and Financial Management—Department of Defense, transmitting notification of emergency munitions disposal, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1518; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3455. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting certification that each military service has developed and implemented a plan to adjust its officer personnel assignment and promotion policies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3456. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 07-94, concerning a cooperative research and development project to be executed by the Department of Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the United Kingdom Ministry of Defense Directorate for Future Systems, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3457. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the production of major defense equipment marketed to Taiwan (Transmittal No. DTC-18-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c) and (d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3458. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Mexico (Transmittal No. DTC-19-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3459. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to



Brunei (Transmittal No. DTC-17-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3460. A letter from the President, Resolution Funding Corporation, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3461. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification that the report on the implementation of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act should be completed by July 1994, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 450j-1(c); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3462. A letter from the Chairman, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Act of 1972, to establish the Pennsylvania Avenue Corporation, to provide for the maintenance and use of the area between the White House and the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3463. A letter from the General Counsel, National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the annual audit report of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, calendar year 1993, pursuant to Public Law 88-449, section 10(b) (78 Stat. 498); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3464. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the disposal of land valued in excess of \$50,000, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2476a; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

3465. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report studying the ability of the State and local governments to rebuild following the January 1993 earthquake in southern California, pursuant to Public Law 103-211, section 404; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Government Operations.

3466. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the results of the audit of the principal financial statements of the U.S. Customs Service for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 305 (104 Stat. 2853); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3707. A bill to establish an American Heritage Areas Partnership Program in the Department of the Interior; with an amendment (Rept. 103-570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 208. An act to reform the concessions policies of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LaFALCE: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 4322. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the authorization for the development company program, and

for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROSE: Committee on House Administration. Investigation of the Office of the Postmaster, pursuant to House Resolution 450 (Rept. 103-573). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2448. A bill to improve the accuracy of radon testing products and services, to increase testing for radon, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GIBBONS: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 373. Resolution disapproving the extension of non-discriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China (Rept. 103-575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3800. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-582 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 537. An act for the relief of Tania Gil Compton (Rept. 103-576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3718. A bill for the relief of Mark A. Potts (Rept. 103-577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2266. A bill for relief of Orlando Wayne Naraysingh (Rept. 103-578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2411. A bill for the relief of Leteane Clement Monatsi (Rept. 103-579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1184. A bill for the relief of Jung Ja Golden (Rept. 103-580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2084. A bill for the relief of Fanie Phily Mateo Angeles; with an amendment (Rept. 103-581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. EHLERS, and Mrs. LLOYD):

H.R. 4684. A bill to authorize and provide program direction for high energy and nuclear physics research at the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LaFALCE:

H.R. 4685. A bill to authorize the establishment of a premier lending program for participation in the certified development com-

pany program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

H.R. 4686. A bill to provide limited relief from high interest rates in certain debentures guaranteed or purchased by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. LAMBERT:

H.R. 4687. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit a State from requiring any child with special health care needs to receive services under the State's plan for medical assistance under such title through enrollment with a capitated managed care plan until the State adopts pediatric risk adjustment methodologies to take into account the costs to capitated managed care plans of providing services to such children, and to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop model pediatric risk adjustment methodologies for such purpose; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 4688. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the Public Health Service Act, and certain other acts to provide for an increase in the number of health professionals serving in rural areas; jointly, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor.

H.R. 4689. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the bonus payment provided for physicians' services furnished under part B of the Medicare Program in a health professional shortage area to 20 percent in the case or primary care services, to establish updates for 1995 in the conversion factors used to determine the amount of payment made for physicians' services under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 4690. A bill to provide assistance for the establishment of community rural health networks in chronically underserved areas, to provide incentives for providers of health care services to furnish services in such areas, to assist providers of emergency medical services in such areas, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUCHER:

H.R. 4691. A bill to establish the Saltville Heritage Area in the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 4692. A bill to establish the Appalachian Coal Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 4693. A bill to prohibit the importation of goods produced abroad with child labor, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BYRNE (for herself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. SISISKY):

H.R. 4694. A bill to exclude from Federal income taxation amounts received in settlement of refund claims for State or local income taxes on Federal retirement benefits which were not subject to State or local income taxation on the same basis as State or local retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 4695. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for procedures under which persons wrongfully arrested by the Postal Inspection Service on narcotics

charges may seek compensation from the U.S. Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4696. A bill to permit an individual to be treated by a health care practitioner with any method of medical treatment such individual requests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona:

H.R. 4697. A bill to modify the boundaries of Walnut Canyon National Monument in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 4698. A bill to terminate price support and marketing quotas for tobacco, disallow the income tax deduction for certain advertising expenses for tobacco products, and to establish a trust fund to support antidrug and antitobacco use activities; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. STARK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. FURSE, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BELENSON, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. VENTO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 4699. A bill to state the sense of Congress on the production, possession, transfer, and use of antipersonnel landmines, to place a moratorium on U.S. production of antipersonnel landmines, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MARKEY and Mr. SABO):

H.R. 4700. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit unjust enrichment in the award of licenses by means of pioneer preferences; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 4701. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FISH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia):

H.R. 4702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow builders to compute on the installment sales method income from the sale of certain residential real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 4703. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to strengthen certain reporting requirements; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KLINK:

H.R. 4704. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands and improvements in Hopewell Township, PA, to a nonprofit organization known as the Beaver County Corp. for Economic Development to provide a site for economic development; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. KOPETSKI:

H.R. 4705. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the Federal share of the cost of the construction of a forest ecosystem research laboratory at Oregon State University in Corvallis, OR, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KREIDLER:

H.R. 4706. A bill to provide for certain reductions in Federal spending at or through facilities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MACHTLEY:

H.R. 4707. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make permanent the visa waiver program and to authorize, under certain conditions, the designation of certain member states of the European Union as visa waiver program countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 4708. A bill to establish a national public works program to provide incentives for the creation of jobs and address the restoration of infrastructure in communities across the United States, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming):

H.R. 4709. A bill to make certain technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 4710. A bill to require the inclusion of provisions relating to worker rights and environmental standards in any trade agreement entered into under any future trade negotiating authority; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 4711. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code with respect to certain debts in connection with divorce or separation; to establish a commission to analyze bankruptcy issues; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MCCANDLESS):

H.R. 4712. A bill to assure that the United States can provide assistance to certain foreign officials to reduce illicit drug traffic; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. UNSOELD (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

H.R. 4713. A bill to promote public confidence in the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CARDIN:

H.R. 4714. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the exception to the market discount rules for tax-exempt obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 4715. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 4716. A bill to provide compensation to certain parties injured under the trade laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEVY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. McKEON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to designate the week of February 6, 1995, as "National Inventors Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. MOLINARI (for herself, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. QUINN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HOKE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. EMERSON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. BLUTE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FROST, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. FURSE, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FISH, and Mr. FLAKE):

H.J. Res. 385. Joint resolution to designate February 2, 1995, and February 1, 1996, as "National Women and Girls in Sports Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. EMERSON):

H. Con. Res. 264. Concurrent resolution establishing a congressional commission for the purpose of assessing the humanitarian, political, and diplomatic conditions in Haiti and reporting to the Congress on the appropriate policy options available to the United States with respect to Haiti; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. FOWLER (for herself, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. DREIER):

H. Res. 472. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3801) to improve the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MANTON (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. MEEHAN):



H. Res. 473. Resolution to raise awareness about domestic violence against women in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 4717. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade and on the Great Lakes and their tributary and connecting waters in trade with Canada for the vessel *Sea Hawk III*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 4718. A bill for the relief of Joe W. Floyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 70: Mr. KYL.  
H.R. 455: Mr. POMEROY.  
H.R. 465: Mr. KYL.  
H.R. 500: Mr. MORAN.  
H.R. 561: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
H.R. 851: Mr. SOLOMON.  
H.R. 1482: Mr. KYL.  
H.R. 1483: Mr. KYL.  
H.R. 1487: Mr. KYL.  
H.R. 1505: Mr. KYL.  
H.R. 1859: Mrs. BYRNE.  
H.R. 1915: Mr. TORKILDSEN.  
H.R. 2088: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut and Mr. SWETT.  
H.R. 2292: Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. BLUTE.  
H.R. 2467: Mr. FLAKE and Mr. KLINK.  
H.R. 2626: Mr. LAFALCE and Ms. PELOSI.  
H.R. 2929: Mr. MCINNIS.  
H.R. 2990: Mr. PARKER.  
H.R. 3024: Mr. BALLENGER.  
H.R. 3039: Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.  
H.R. 3270: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. BYRNE, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PARKER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ROSE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TUCKER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WISE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SHARP, Mr. REED, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Da-

kota, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. VENTO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 3407: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 3458: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3472: Mr. McHALE.

H.R. 3483: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 3519: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 3523: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 3630: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 3906: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 4050: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 4058: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 4074: Mr. YATES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 4088: Mr. KING.

H.R. 4181: Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 4257: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 4271: Mr. McDADE.

H.R. 4291: Mr. MINGE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 4386: Mr. KING.

H.R. 4404: Mr. RICHARDSON and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 4411: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4413: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 4427: Mr. FOGLIETTA and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 4475: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FISH, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 4477: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. BARLOW.

H.R. 4495: Mr. SWETT, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 4496: Mr. SWETT, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Mr. BEILINSON.

H.R. 4497: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.R. 4517: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4570: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. FURSE, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. LLOYD, Mrs. FOWLER, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 4580: Mrs. MEK of Florida, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 4590: Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 4617: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. LUCAS.

H.J. Res. 160: Mr. LUCAS.

H.J. Res. 256: Mr. BALLENGER.

H.J. Res. 326: Mr. POMBO and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.J. Res. 349: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FARR, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COX, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.J. Res. 363: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DEAL, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FARR, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. FILNER,

Mr. CONDIT, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DANNER, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. McHALE, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. WATT, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MANN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. KLUG, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. DORNAN.

H.J. Res. 366: Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. COX, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Ms. DUNN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FROST, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLINK, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McHALE, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SISKI, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TALENT, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WISE.

H.J. Res. 378: Mr. McNULTY.

H.J. Res. 383: Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H. Con. Res. 90: Mr. KYL.

H. Con. Res. 166: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. CANADY, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

H. Con. Res. 243: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 256: Mr. UPTON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. DARDEN.

### DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXVII, the following discharge petitions were filed:

Petition 23, June 29, 1994, by Mr. TAUZIN on the bill H.R. 3875, was signed by the following Members: W.J. (Billy) Tauzin, Bill McCollum, Jack Fields, John J. Duncan, Jr., Richard K. Arney, Frank D. Lucas, Dan Schaefer, Pat Roberts, Philip M. Crane, James V. Hansen, Wayne Allard, Joe Barton, Craig Thomas, Don Sundquist, Sonny Calhoun, Harold Rogers, Stephen E. Buyer, Dan Burton, Bob Stump, Jim McCrery, Mel Hancock, Cass Ballenger, Don Young, John Linder, Bill Baker, Michael D. Crapo, Tom DeLay, John T. Doolittle, Alfred A. (Al)

McCandless, Wally Herger, Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Jim Bunning, J. Alex McMillan, Jack Kingston, Terry Everett, Bill Emerson, Joe Skeen, Charles H. Taylor, J. Dennis Hastert, Thomas W. Ewing, Christopher Cox, Scott McInnis, Jay Dickey, Dan Rohrabacher, Peter Hoekstra, Bill Archer, Peter Blute, Michael Bilirakis, Robert F. (Bob) Smith, Joel Hefley, Bob Livingston, William M. Thomas, Lamar Smith, Howard Coble, James A. Traficant, Dan Miller, Mike Parker, Larry Combest, Henry Bonilla, Ken Calvert, Jerry Lewis, John L. Mica, Charles Wilson, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Richard W. Pombo, James M. Inhofe, Barbara F. Vucanovich, Ron Packard, Michael Huffington, Joe Knollenberg, Ralph M. Hall, Duncan Hunter, Jim Lightfoot, Tillie K. Fowler, Dave Camp, John A. Boehner, Paul E. Gillmor, Bill Paxton, Sam Johnson, Gary A. Condit, J. Roy Rowland, Robert H. Michel, Jim Kolbe, Michael G. Oxley, Floyd Spence, Donald A. Manzullo, Gerald B.H. Solomon, John M. McHugh, Charles W. Stenholm, James A. Hayes, Pete Geren, Nick Smith, James H. (Jimmy) Quillen, Robert K. Dornan, C.W. Bill Young, Carlos J. Moorhead, Jon Kyl, William F. Clinger, Jr., E. Clay Shaw, Jr., Richard H. Baker, Newt Gingrich, David

Dreier, Mac Collins, Peter T. King, Bill Barrett, Bill K. Brewster, Jim Nussle, David L. Hobson, Frank D. Lucas, Henry J. Hyde, William H. Zeff, Jr., William F. Goodling, Jay Kim, Cliff Stearns, Elton Gallegly, Charles T. Canady, Helen Delich Bentley, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Susan Molinari, Stephen Horn, Martin R. Hoke, Thomas J. Ridge, Robert S. Walker, Calvin M. Dooley, Rob Portman, and Porter J. Goss.

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 11 by Mr. RAMSTAD on House Resolution 247: David Dreier and Steve Gunderson.

Petition 16 by Mr. ZELIFF on House Resolution 407: Jim Slattery.

Petition 17 by Mr. SHAW on House Resolution 386: Richard H. Baker, Joseph H. McDade, Sherwood L. Boehlert, Frank R. Wolf, Duncan Hunter, C.W. Bill Young, Michael Bilirakis, Don Young, Helen Delich Bentley, Joe Skeen, Bill Emerson, John R. Kasich, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Robert K. Dor-

nan, Sonny Callahan, Christopher H. Smith, Wally Herger, Harold Rogers, James V. Hansen, Joe Barton, Robert F. (Bob) Smith, James M. Inhofe, Spencer Bachus, Susan Molinari, David L. Hobson, and Martin R. Hoke.

Petition 18 by Mr. HASTERT on House Resolution 402: Don Sundquist.

Petition 19 by Mr. EWING on House Resolution 415: Jack Kingston, Newt Gingrich, Tom DeLay, Gerald B.H. Solomon, Ralph M. Hall, Robert S. Walker, Peter Blute, Christopher Cox, Bob Livingston, Lamar S. Smith, Jack Quinn, Jim Chapman, and Steve Gunderson.

Petition 20 by Mr. SANGMEISTER on House Resolution: Michael Bilirakis and Dan Miller.

Petition 22 by Mr. INHOFE on House Resolution 409: Ron Lewis, Toby Roth, James A. Barcia, Nick Smith, Newt Gingrich, Roscoe G. Bartlett, John Linder, Michael D. Crapo, Donald A. Manzullo, Ernest J. Istook, Jr., Bob Franks, Bill Paxton, John T. Doolittle, Gerald B.H. Solomon, Ralph M. Hall, Richard K. Armey, James M. Talent, Deborah Pryce, Bill McCollum, Mel Hancock, Scott McInnis, Christopher Cox, Craig Thomas, Spencer Bachus, and Steve Gunderson.